

106079

JPRS-UKO-88-004
18 FEBRUARY 1988



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

No 17, November 1987

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980716 068

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

10
95
A04

Soviet Union
KOMMUNIST
No 17, November 1987

JPRS-UKO-88-004

CONTENTS

18 FEBRUARY 1988

October and Restructuring. The Revolution Goes On [M.S. Gorbachev]	1
Leningrad In October [V. Kadulin and S. Kolesnikov]	25
Acceleration and Science in Siberia	34
Global Problems and Microbiology [G.A. Zavarzin]	47
Alliance Between Family Physician and Computer [S.N. Fedorov]	53
Lenin. Genoa. New Diplomacy [S.A. Dangulov]	55
Big Changes [V.G. Burov]	62
From One Earth to An Integral World	68
'Why Did I Decide to Write This Letter?' [A.M. Ivanov]	71
Going Back to the 'Nezhin Story,' Readers' Discussion	74
Books on Victorious October	77
Ten Days and a Lifetime [D. Shelestov]	80
The Problem of Historical Choice [A. Frolov]	83
Painters in the Great Patriotic War [A. Lebedev]	85
New Studies of U.S. Foreign Policy [V. Furayev]	87
Meeting with Workers	91
Chronicle	92
Publication Data	92

KOMMUNIST

No 17, November 1987

[Translation of the Russian-language theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow 18 times per year.]

October and Restructuring. The Revolution Goes On

18020005a Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 3-40

[Report by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the joint ceremonious session of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, delivered at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 2 November 1987]

[Text] Dear comrades:

Respected foreign guests:

Seven decades separate us from the unforgettable days of October 1917, the legendary days with which the new age of social progress, of true human history, began. October is truly the "starry hour" of mankind, its dawn. The October Revolution is the revolution by the people and for the people, for man, for his liberation and development.

Seven decades is a very short slice of time in the age-old ascent of world civilization. In terms of the scale of accomplishment, however, there has been no other period in history such as the one covered by our country after the victory of the Great October. Nor is there any greater honor than to be the pioneer, to dedicate all efforts, energy, knowledge and ability to the triumph of the ideas and objectives of the October Revolution! (applause).

An anniversary is a time of pride. It is pride in accomplishments. Our lot was one of most severe trials. We withstood them honorably. We not simply withstood them but took the country out of dislocation and backwardness, turned it into a powerful state, reorganizing life and unrecognizably changing the spiritual world of man. In the course of the fiercest battles of the 20th century, we defended the right to have our own way of life and protected our future. We also are proud, quite rightly, of the fact that our revolution, labor and struggle are continuing to have a most profound impact on all aspects of global developments—politics, economics, the social area and the consciousness of our contemporaries.

An anniversary is a time of remembrance. It is a remembrance of the millions of people, every one of whom made a contribution to our common socialist gains, of

those who smelted steel, sowed the grain, taught children, advanced science and technology, and reached the height of the arts. It is a sad remembrance of those who, in defending the homeland, fell in battle, enabling society to advance at the cost of their own lives. It is an ineradicable memory of past experiences, for it is they that led to the present day.

An anniversary is a time of reflection. We think of difficult and complex occasional development of our affairs and destinies. There was everything: heroism, tragedy, great victories and bitter failures. We think of the 70 years of stressed building from the positions of a people ready to harness its entire strength and the entire tremendous potential of socialism for the revolutionary reorganization of life.

An anniversary is also a look into the future. Our achievements are tremendous, substantial and significant. They are a firm foundation, a base for new accomplishments, for the further development of society. It is precisely in the development of socialism, in the continuation of the ideas and practices of Leninism and the October Revolution that we see the essence of our current affairs and concerns, our prime task and moral obligation. This dictates the need for a serious and thorough study of the historical significance of the October Revolution and of everything which has been accomplished over the past 7 post-October decades (applause).

I. The Path of the October Revolution Is the Path of the Pioneers

Comrades: Our path as pioneers is tremendous and difficult. It cannot be described in a short analysis. There were the burdens of the material and moral legacy of the old world, World War I, the civil war and the intervention. There were the novelty of changes related to the hopes of the people and the pace and scale of rushing into a new, unaccustomed area, which sometimes left no time to look around, to think; there were also subjective factors which played a special role in periods of revolutionary tempests. There were concepts of the future imbued with the maximalism of revolutionary times, sometimes simplified. There was also the pure and furious aspiration of the fighters for a new life to do everything as quickly, better and more fairly as possible.

The past—its heroism and drama—cannot fail to excite the minds of our contemporaries. We have only one history, and it is irreversible. Whatever emotions it may trigger, it is our history, it is dear to us (applause). Today we turn back to the days of October which shook the world. We seek and find in them a firm spiritual support and instructive lessons. Again and again we realize the accuracy of the socialist choice which was made with the October Revolution.

The objective logic of the historical progress of mankind itself led to that point. The October Revolution, with all of its controversial nature and civilization's multiplicity

of ways of progress, was the legitimate result of the development of the ideas and practices of the age-long struggle waged by the working people for freedom, peace, and social justice, and against class, national and spiritual oppression.

The events of 1917 proved that choosing between socialism and capitalism is the main social choice of our age and that one cannot advance in the 20th century without marching toward a higher form of social organization, toward socialism. This basic Leninist conclusion is no less relevant today than when it was made. Such is the law governing progressive social development.

The revolution in Russia became the peak of the freedom aspirations, the living embodiment of the dreams of the best minds of mankind, from the great humanists of the past to the proletarian revolutionaries of the 19th and 20th centuries. The events of 1917 imbued within themselves the energy of the popular struggle for independent development and independence, progressive national movements, antiserfdom peasant uprisings and wars, characteristic of our history. They embodied the spiritual searches of the enlighteners of the 18th century, the heroes and marchers of the Decembrist movement, the fiery tribunes of revolutionary democracy and the moral dedication of the great leaders of our culture.

The time when, at the dawn of the 20th century, Vladimir Ilich Lenin led a closely united group of like-minded people toward creating in Russia a proletarian party of a new type was of decisive importance to the destinies of our country. It was precisely this great Leninist Party that led the people, using its best and honest forces, to the storming of the old world.

The cornerstone for success of the October Revolution was laid during the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907. This included the bitter lessons of 9 January, the desperate heroism at the Moscow barricades in December, the exploits of thousands of known and unknown fighters for freedom and the birth of the first worker soviets—the prototype of the Soviet system.

The victory of the Great October Revolution also developed from the accomplishments of the February 1917 revolution, which was the first victorious people's revolution in the age of imperialism. After the February victory the development of the revolution followed with incredible speed. Its main characters were workers and peasants in soldiers' overcoats. The spring of 1917 proved the power of the nationwide movement. At the same time, it also brought to light its limitations, the contradictory nature of the revolutionary awareness at that stage and the force of historical inertia, as a result of which the exploiting classes which were leaving the stage were able to benefit for a while from the results of the popular victory.

The February revolution put in the hands of the October Revolution its main weapon—the organization of the system in guise of the restored soviets. February marked the first experience in real democracy, in the practical political upbringing of the masses, acquired during the most complex conditions of twin power. February is also unique in terms of the possibilities it provided for a peaceful shifting of power to the the working people, possibilities which, unfortunately, were not realized by virtue of the historical circumstances of reality. February was a most important historical stage on the way to the October Revolution.

Within the complex interweaving and confrontation of the class forces which participated in the February revolution, Lenin brilliantly realized the possibilities which had appeared for the victory of a socialist revolution. The April theses were a scientific prediction and a model of revolutionary program for action under those historical conditions. Lenin indicated not only the logic of the growth of the bourgeois-democratic into a socialist revolution but also the form assumed by this process—through the soviets, their bolshevizing, the essence of which was to help the people, the masses to understand the meaning of their own struggle and consciously to make a revolution in their own interest. The path from February to October was a time of headlong social change, a time of fast political maturing of the masses and the consolidation of the forces of the revolution and its vanguard, the Leninist Party.

During that period, between February and October, the political skills displayed by Lenin and his fellow workers, who provided instructive lessons in live dialectics of revolutionary thinking and action, was manifested with particular emphasis. The party's leadership proved its ability for collective and creative searching, rejection of stereotypes and slogans which, only the day before, under different circumstances, seemed indisputable and exclusive. One could say that the very trend of Lenin's thoughts and all activities of the bolsheviks, distinguished by a fast change in the ways and means of work, flexibility and inordinate tactical solutions and political daring, provided the most outstanding model of antidogmatic and truly dialectical and, therefore, new model of thinking. It is thus and only thus that true Marxists-Leninists think and act, particularly during critical times of change, when the destinies of a revolution, peace, socialism and progress are decided (*applause*).

But let us return to April 1917: Lenin's program for a turn to a socialist revolution seemed to many, both friends and enemies, a utopia, almost the product of an unbridled imagination. Life proved, however, that it was only such a program that could and, in fact, did become the political foundation for the further development of the revolution and, essentially, the foundation for social salvation and prevention of national catastrophe.

Let us recall the July days of 1917. How painful it was for the party to abandon the slogan of shifting all power to the soviets. However, no other way was possible, for the

soviets turned out, for awhile at least, to be in the hands of the SR and the mensheviks and were helpless in the face of the counterrevolution. How sensitively Lenin kept his fingers on the pulse beat of the revolution, and how brilliantly he determined the beginning of a new rebirth of the soviets which, in the course of the struggle, were acquiring a truly popular nature, which enabled them to become the agencies of the victorious armed uprising and, subsequently, the political form of the worker-peasant system.

All this is not simply pages in the chronicles of the Great Revolution. It is also a constant reminder to us, the living, of the high duty of the communists always to be on the cutting edge of events, to be able to make daring decisions and to assume full responsibility for the present and the future (*applause*).

The October Revolution was the powerful thrust of millions of people, combining the basic interests of the working class, the age-old expectations of the peasantry, the thirst of soldiers and seamen for peace, and the unbreakable desire of the peoples of multinational Russia for freedom and light. Within the complex interweaving of different interests, the Bolshevik Party was able to find the main features, to combine disparate trends and aspirations and to channel them into solving the basic problem of the revolution, the problem of power. In its very first decrees, the decrees on peace and land, the state of proletarian dictatorship answered through its actions the demands of the time. It expressed the profound interests not only of the working class but of the absolute majority of the people.

Today we must recall yet another most important, essential lesson of the October days. In our time Lenin's answer to the question raised by life and revolutionary reality is exceptionally relevant, the question of the correlation between the theoretical "model" of the way to socialism and the real practice of building socialism. As a creative doctrine, Marxism-Leninism is not a collection of ready-made prescriptions and doctrinary stipulations. Marxist-Leninist doctrine, which is alien to narrow-minded dogmatism, ensures the active interaction between innovative theoretical thinking and practical experience, the very course of the revolutionary struggle. The Great October Revolution is an instructive example of this fact.

As we know many leaders of the labor movement of that time, even noted ones, refused to see in the October Socialist Revolution a legitimate phenomenon. They claimed that it had taken place "not according to the rules," not in accordance with existing theoretical views. As they saw it, by October 1917 Russian capitalism had not created all the necessary material and cultural prerequisites for socialism. We believe that it would be instructive and useful to recall Lenin's answer to such critics of our revolution. "You say that civilization is needed for the creation of socialism," he objected. "Very well. But why should we not begin by creating the type of

prerequisite for civilization in our country, such as expelling the landowners and Russian capitalists and only then initiate the movement toward socialism?" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 381).

Those who interpret Marxism in a dogmatic and pedantic way cannot understand the main aspect of this theory—its revolutionary dialectics. It is precisely this dialectics that distinguishes all of Lenin's post-October activities. It was precisely this that made it possible to accomplish, literally on the line separating the possible from the impossible, the political and moral exploit of the Brest peace, which saved thousands and thousands of lives and the very existence of the socialist fatherland.

Here is another example: Like Marx and Engels, Lenin was convinced that the people's militia will become the armed defense of the revolution. However, specific conditions dictated a different solution. The civil war imposed upon the people, as well as foreign intervention, demanded a new approach. The Worker-Peasant Red Army was created by Leninist decree. This was an army of a new type, which covered itself with immortal glory in the civil war and in repelling the foreign intervention (*applause*).

Those were years of harsh trials for the young Soviet system. The question which arose in its entire simplicity and brutality was the following: Will there be or will there not be socialism? The party rallied and mobilized the people for the defense of the socialist fatherland and the gains of the October Revolution. Hungry, unclad and shoeless, and poorly armed the Red soldiers defeated the well trained and armed counterrevolutionary army, generously supported by imperialists from the West and the East. The flames of the civil war spread throughout the country, affecting each family, plowing through the ordinary way of life, mentality and destinies of people. It was the will of the people, the aspiration of millions of people for a new life that prevailed in this battle to the death (*applause*). The country did everything it could to help the young army. It lived and acted under the slogan coined by Lenin: "Everything for victory!"

We shall forever remember the exploits of the legendary heroes, the courageous seamen and mounted army men, the fighters and commanders in the young Red Army and the Red guerrillas. They defended the revolution. Glory to them! (*prolonged applause*).

The decision concerning a new economic policy, which substantially broadened the horizons of the concepts about socialism and the ways of building it, is itself imbued with profound revolutionary dialectics.

Or else, consider the following question: As we know, Lenin criticized the limitations of "cooperative socialism." Under the specific conditions which developed after the October Revolution, as a result of the seizure of

power by the people, he took a new look at the problem. In his article "On the Cooperative," he developed the concept of socialism as a society of "civilized members of cooperatives."

Such were the strength and daring of Marxist dialectics, which expressed the very essence of revolutionary doctrine and which was so brilliantly mastered by Lenin. Lenin believed that in building the new world "we shall have to finish, redo, start from the beginning, over and over again" (op cit., vol 44, p 224).

Yes, we have had to refinish and redo, to wage a long and stubborn struggle, and to experience historical processes of a crucial and revolutionary nature. They greatly changed the circumstances and conditions governing our progress. They changed us as well, tempering and enriching us with experience and knowledge, giving us even greater confidence in the success of the cause of the revolution.

As we assess on a universal-historical scale the distance we have covered, we realize again and again that within a short time we have accomplished something which took others centuries (*applause*).

The Socialist Revolution was made in a country with a medium level of capitalist development, high concentration of industry, predominantly peasant population and profound vestiges of feudalism and even of older social systems. Russia gave the world some of its greatest accomplishments in science and culture although three-quarters of its population was illiterate. The country had been wrecked to an extreme degree by the imperialist war and inept administration.

The building of a new life had no model. It presumed a tireless search for constructive solutions. To the Communist Party the objective was clear—revolution and a socialist way, and a Soviet system. It was precisely down this way that Lenin led the party.

The principles and standards of the future socialist system and historically unparalleled forms of social organization were crystallized in the live creativity of the masses, out of the most complex material of the mixed Russian economy. Initially purely theoretical concepts on the forms of popular rule, ways and limits of socialization of ownership, organization of socialist production and development of a new comradely discipline and the place and role of men in the new society were refined and given a real practical content.

The main purpose of the October Revolution was to build a new life. This was not halted, not even for a single day. Even short breathing spells were used to build and seek the ways to a socialist future.

The start of the 1920s marked the greatest burst of popular initiative and creativity. That period became a truly revolutionary laboratory for social innovation and

search for optimal forms of alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry and for shaping the mechanism for meeting the entire range of interests of the working people.

From the methods of war communism in organizing production and consumption, which were forced by the conditions of the war and dislocation, the party converted to more flexible, economically substantiated, "regular" instruments for influencing social reality. The measures included in the new economic policy were aimed at laying the material foundations for socialism.

Today we turn with increased frequency to Ilich's last works and Lenin's ideas of a new economic policy, trying to borrow from this experience everything that is valuable and needed by us now. Naturally, it would be erroneous to equate the NEP with what we are doing today, when we have reached an essentially different stage of development. Today the country has no private farmers, the alliance with whom determined the most vital objectives of economic policy in the 1920s.

However, the NEP had a longer-range target as well. The task had been set of building a new society "not directly based on enthusiasm," as Lenin wrote, "but with the help of enthusiasm born of the Great Revolution, on the basis of personal interest and cost accounting.... That is what life and the objective course of development of the revolution told us" (op cit., vol 44, p 151).

In speaking of the creative potential of the NEP, obviously, we should mention once again the political and methodological wealth of the tax-in-kind concept. Naturally, we are interested not in the forms it had at that time, the purpose of which was to link workers with peasants, but the possibilities it included for releasing the constructive energy of the masses, upgrading the initiative of man and eliminating the bureaucratic obstacles which limited the effect of the basic principle of socialism: "From each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work."

The building of socialism which was initiated under Lenin's leadership, brought a great deal of essentially new factors.

For the first time in world history planned economic management methods were formulated and applied. The GOELRO plan was a true discovery, an entire stage in the development of global economic thinking and practice. It was not only a tremendous plan for electrification but, as conceived by Lenin, a plan for the "harmonious combination" of agriculture with industry and transportation or, in modern terms, a comprehensive program for the location and development of the country's production forces. Lenin described it as the second party program, a "work plan for restoring the entire national economy and raising it to the level of contemporary technology" (op cit., vol 42, p 157).

A new culture was developing, which embraced the experience of the past and the great wealth, daring and originality of talent and outstanding individualities made by the revolution and inspired to serve the people. To us the initial, the Leninist stage in shaping the multinational state of soviets is of permanent significance, not only because of its results but also its experience and methodology.

In thinking of the time when "out of a Russia of the NEP will come a socialist Russia," Lenin neither could nor did set himself the task of painting a picture of the future society in complete detail. However, the ways and means of advancing toward socialism themselves, through the creation of a machine industry, extensive cooperativization and comprehensive involvement of the toiling masses in the management of the state, organizing the work of the state machinery based on the "better less but better" principle, the "cultural development of the entire people's mass," and strengthening the federation of free nations "without lies or steel," were precisely the factors which would shape the image of the country rising toward an essentially higher social system.

A system of views and the very concept of building socialism in our country are found in Lenin's last works, which are inordinately saturated intellectually and emotionally. This is the party's tremendous theoretical wealth.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin's premature death was the greatest possible blow to the party and the Soviet people. The grief was unbearable and the loss irrecoverable. Everyone understood this. Projects of tremendous historical significance lay ahead. Without Lenin, but leaning on his teaching and behests the party's leadership had to find optimal solutions which could consolidate the gains of the revolution and lead the country to socialism under the specific conditions of Soviet Russia of that period.

History gave the new system a strict ultimatum: Either develop its own socioeconomic and technical base within the shortest possible time, survive and give mankind its first experience in a just organization of society or else fade out, at best leaving in to the centuries to come the memory of a heroic but failed social experiment. Above all it was the question of accelerating the pace of socialist change that assumed a vital, a fatal importance in the full meaning of the term.

The period after Lenin's death—the 1920s and 1930s—assumed a special place in the history of the Soviet state. In some 15 years radical social changes were made. A great deal was included in that period from the viewpoints of seeking optimal choices for building socialism and of what was actually accomplished in laying the foundations for the new society. Those were years of stubborn toil stressing human possibilities to the limit. It was a period of sharp and comprehensive struggle. Industrialization, collectivization, cultural revolution,

strengthening the multinational state, asserting the international positions of the USSR and the new forms of managing economic and all social life all happened precisely during that period, and all had far-reaching consequences.

Again and again, as the decades passed, we have looked back to those times. This is natural, for it was then that the building of the first socialist society in the world was being started. This was an exploit of historical scale and significance. The admiration felt for the exploits of our fathers and grandfathers and the assessment of our true accomplishments will live forever, as will the exploits and accomplishments themselves (*applause*). And if today we occasionally look at our history critically, it is only because we wish to have a better, a fuller idea of our path to the future.

We must assess the past with a feeling of historical responsibility and on the basis of historical truth. This must be done, first of all, because of the tremendous importance which those years had in the destinies of our state and of socialism. Second, because those years have been the focal point of long discussions, at home and abroad, in which, along with seeking the truth, there have been frequent attempts to discredit socialism as a new social system and a real alternative to capitalism. Finally, we need truthful assessments of this and all other periods in our history, particularly now, when restructuring has developed. We need them not for the sake of settling political scores or, as they say, to strain our souls, but for the sake of giving its proper due to anything heroic which occurred in the past and to learn from errors and blunders.

And so, let us think of the 20 or 30 years after Lenin. Although the party and society had been given Lenin's concept for building socialism, and Vladimir Ilich's works of the post-October period, the search of a way was quite difficult, conducted in the course of a sharp ideological struggle, in an atmosphere of political discussions. They were focused on the basic problems of the development of society and, above all, that of building socialism in our country. Theory and practice looked at the directions and forms for the implementation of socioeconomic changes and for ways to ensuring their implementation on a socialist basis under the specific historical circumstances in which they Soviet Union had found itself.

Practical and constructive work, which demanded the highest responsibility, was on the agenda. Above all, the question of the country's industrialization and economic reconstruction arose urgently, without which building socialism and strengthening defense capability were inconceivable. This was based on Lenin's direct instructions and theoretical legacy. The question of socialist changes in the countryside arose with the same urgency and also in accordance with Lenin's behests.

Therefore, this applied to most important and crucial affairs, problems and tasks. And although, let me repeat, the party had Lenin's stipulations on such matters, sharp discussions on such topics broke out.

It must be clearly pointed out that both before and after the revolution, in the first years of building socialism, by no means did all party leaders share Lenin's views on a number of most important problems. Furthermore, Lenin's recommendations could not cover all specific aspects of building a new society. When we study the ideological arguments of that time we must bear in mind that in itself making huge revolutionary changes in a country such as Russia was at that time a most difficult task. The country was in its historical advance. Its development was being drastically accelerated and all aspects of social life were changing quickly and profoundly.

The ideological struggle, which reflected the entire range of interest of the individual classes, social groups and strata, the demands and tasks of the time, historical traditions, the pressure of urgent problems and the conditions created by a hostile capitalist encirclement, was an ideological struggle which was inseparably intertwined with events and processes in economics, politics and all other areas of human life.

In short, it was exceptionally difficult to find the way, to find the only true course in such complex and tempestuous situations. The nature of the ideological struggle was significantly complicated also by personal rivalry within the country's leadership. The old differences which had existed while Lenin was still alive were manifested quite sharply under the new situation as well. Lenin, as we know, had warned of the possibility of such a danger. In his "Letter to the Congress" he had emphasized that "this is no petty matter, or else it is the type of petty matter which could assume decisive significance" (op cit., vol 45, p 346). This was largely what happened.

Petit-bourgeois features gained the upper hand in some authoritative personalities. They organized factions. This disturbed the party organizations, distracted them from real action and hindered their work. These leaders continued to promote splits even after it had become clear to the overwhelming majority within the party that their views were conflicting with Lenin's ideas and plans and that their suggestions were wrong and could lead the country astray from its rightly chosen course.

This applied above all to L.D. Trotsky who, after Lenin's death, displayed an excessive aspiration to leadership in the party, fully confirming Lenin's assessment of his character as an excessively self-confident and always prevaricating and dishonest politician. Trotsky and the Trotskyites rejected the possibility of building socialism under the conditions of capitalism encirclement. In foreign policy they were relying on the export of revolution and, in domestic policy, "tightening the screws" in terms of the peasantry, the exploitation of the country by

the town and the use of administrative-military methods in social management. Trotskyism is a political trend whose ideologues, concealing behind left-wing pseudorevolutionary phraseology, basically held a capitulationist position. Essentially, it was an attack mounted against Leninism along the entire front. In practical terms, it was a question of the destinies of socialism in our country and the fate of the revolution.

Under these circumstances, Trotskyism had to be debunked on a nationwide basis and its antisocialist nature had to be exposed. The situation was worsened by the fact that the Trotskyites had allied themselves with the "new opposition," headed by G.Ye. Zinoviev and L.B. Kamenev. Aware of the fact that they were in the minority, the leaders of the opposition again and again imposed discussions within the party, hoping for split in the party's ranks. In the final account, however, the party spoke out in favor of the line followed by the Central Committee and against the opposition, which was routed ideologically and organizationally (*applause*).

It was thus that the party's leading nucleus, headed by J.V. Stalin, defended Leninism in the ideological struggle, formulated the strategy and tactics for the initial stage in building socialism, and secured approval of its political course by the majority of party members and working people. N.I. Bukharin, F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, S.M. Kirov, G.K. Ordzhonikidze, Ya.E. Rudzutak and others played an important role in the ideological routing of Trotskyism (*applause*).

Toward the very end of the 1920s a sharp struggle broke out also on the question of converting the peasantry to socialism. It essentially revealed differences between the views of the Politburo majority and the Bukharin group concerning the application of the principles of the NEP at the new stage in the development of Soviet society.

The specific circumstances of that time, both domestic and international, had formulated the pressing task of significantly intensifying the pace of building socialism. Bukharin and his supporters underestimated in their computations and theoretical concepts the significance of the time factor in building socialism in the 1930s. Their views were largely determined by dogmatic thinking and a nondialectical assessment of specific circumstances. Soon afterwards, both Bukharin and his supporters admitted their errors.

It would be pertinent in this connection to recall Lenin's characterization of Bukharin: "Bukharin is not only a most valuable and a major party theoretician but also is legitimately considered the favorite of the entire party. However, his theoretical views could be considered as entirely Marxist very circumspectly, for they include something scholastic (he never studied dialectics and, I believe, never understood it fully)" (op cit., vol 45, p 345). Once again reality confirmed Lenin's accuracy.

Therefore, the political debates at that time reflected the complex process in the development of the party, characterized by a sharp struggle on the most important problems of building socialism. The concept of industrialization and collectivization developed in the course of this necessary struggle.

Under the leadership of the party and its Central Committee, within a short time a heavy industry, which included machine building a defense industry and chemical production, modern for its time were, created virtually from scratch. The GOELRO plan was implemented. Magnitka, Kuzbass, Dneproges, Uralmash, the Khibi Combine, the motor vehicle plants in Moscow and Gorkiy, aerospace plants, the Stalingrad, Chelyabinsk and Kharkov tractor plants, Rostselmash, Komsomolsk-na-Amure, Turksib, the Bolshoy Ferganskiy Canal and many other great projects of the first 5-year periods became the glorious symbols of such accomplishments. During that period dozens of scientific research institutes and a broad network of higher educational institutions were established.

The party offered a previously unknown way of industrialization: advancing immediately heavy industry without relying on outside financial sources or waiting for slow accumulations based on the development of light industry. This was the only possible way open to the country and the people under the then prevailing circumstances, although it was an incredibly difficult one. It was an innovative step in which the revolutionary thrust of the masses was considered a component of economic growth. In a single leap industrialization took the country to a qualitatively new level. By the end of the 1930s the Soviet Union had assumed a leading position in Europe and was in second place in the world in terms of industrial output and had become a truly great industrial power. This was a labor exploit of universal-historical significance, the exploit of liberated labor, the feat of the Bolshevik Party (*applause*).

Taking a sober look at history and taking into consideration the totality of domestic and international realities, we cannot fail to ask ourselves the following question: Was it possible under those circumstances to choose a course other than the one suggested by the party? If we are to remain on the positions of historicism and the truth of life, the only possible answer is that no, no other course was possible (*applause*). Under those circumstances, when the threat of imperialist aggression was visibly increasing, the party believed in the need not to walk but, within extremely short time, literally to run the distance from the sledge-hammer and the wooden plow to a developed industry, without which the entire cause of the revolution was inevitably doomed.

The viability of the plans formulated by the party, which were understood and accepted by the masses, and the slogans and plans which embodied the revolutionary spirit of the October Revolution were manifested in the

enthusiasm, which amazed the world, with which millions of Soviet people joined in the building of the Soviet industry. Under most difficult circumstances, without mechanization, malnourished, the people created miracles. They were inspired by the fact that they were participating in a great historical cause. Although insufficiently knowledgeable, their class sense indicated to them that they were participating in a tremendous and unheard of project.

Our duty and the duty of those who will follow us is to remember this exploit committed by our fathers and grandfathers. Everyone must know that their labor and selfless dedication were not wasted. They surmounted everything which they encountered. They made a tremendous contribution to consolidating the gains of the October Revolution and to laying the foundations of our strength, which made it possible to save the homeland from a mortal danger, to preserve socialism for the future, for us, comrades. Glory to them and to their memory! (*sustained applause*).

However, losses as well were incurred during the period under consideration. To a certain extent they were related to those same successes I mentioned. There was belief then in the universal efficiency of strict centralization and the fact that command methods were the shortest and best way to solve any problem. This influenced the attitude toward the people and their living conditions.

An administrative-command system of party-state leadership of the country appeared; bureaucracy, against the danger of which Lenin had warned in his time, was gathering strength. Corresponding management structures and planning methods began to develop. In industry, considering its extent at that time, when all major industrial projects were literally visible, generally speaking such a management system yielded results. However, such a rigid system of centralization and command was inadmissible in solving the problems of reorganizing the countryside.

We must frankly say that in the new stage there was a lack of a Leninist-type attentive attitude toward the interests of the toiling peasantry. Above all, the fact that the peasantry as a class had radically changed in the time after the revolution was underestimated. The middle peasant had become the main character. He had established himself as the owner. It was that same working peasant who had been given land by the revolution and, in the course of an entire decade, had come to believe that the Soviet system was his own. He had become, on the basis of a new type of alliance, a loyal and reliable ally of the working class, convinced in practice that his life would increasingly improve in the future.

If we had taken more into account the objective economic laws and paid greater attention to the social processes which were developing in the countryside; in general, had the attitude toward this tremendous array of

toiling peasantry, most of whom had taken part in the revolution and defended it from the White Guards and the intervention, been politically more trusted; and if a consistent line of alliance with the middle peasants and against the kulaks had been systematically followed, the breakdowns which occurred in collectivization would not have taken place.

It is clear today that there were violations of Leninist policy toward the peasantry in this tremendous project which affected the destinies of the majority of the country's population. Leadership in this most important and very complex social process, in which a great deal depended on local conditions, was provided primarily through administrative methods. The conviction developed that all problems could be solved in one fell swoop and within the shortest possible time. Entire oblasts and parts of the country began to compete as to who would achieve total collectivization faster. Arbitrary production percentages were issued by the leadership. Gross violations of the principles of collectivization became comprehensive. Nor were breakdowns avoided in waging the struggle against the kulaks. In itself, the accurate line of struggle against the kulaks was frequently given such a broad interpretation as to include a significant percentage of the middle peasantry. This is a historical reality.

However, comrades, an overall evaluation of the significance of collectivization in strengthening the positions of socialism in the countryside would indicate that, in the final account, it was a turning point of essential significance. Collectivization meant a radical change in the entire way of life of the bulk of the country's population, on a socialist basis. It created a social base for modernizing the agrarian sector and converting it to educated farming. It enabled us significantly to increase labor productivity and released a significant share of manpower which was needed in the other areas of building socialism. All of this had historical consequences.

In order to understand the situation of that time, we must bear in mind that the administrative-command system, which began to take shape in the course of industrialization and which acquired a new impetus in the period of collectivization, affected the entire sociopolitical life of the country. Having established itself in the economy, it spread to the superstructure, restricting the development of the democratic potential of socialism and holding back the progress of socialist democracy.

This, however, does not cover the entire complexity of that period. What happened? Ideological and political tests, which were the most important to the party, were actually neglected. Millions of people had enthusiastically joined in the making of socialist changes. Initial successes appeared. Meanwhile, the methods dictated by the period of the struggle against the hostile opposition of exploiting classes was automatically transferred to the

period of peaceful building of socialism, when conditions had radically changed. An atmosphere of intolerance, hostility and suspicion was created in the country. Subsequently, such political practices were expanded and substantiated with the erroneous "theory" of the aggravation of the class struggle in the course of building socialism.

All of this had a ruinous influence on the country's sociopolitical development and led to severe consequences. It is entirely clear that it was precisely the lack of the necessary standard of democratization of Soviet society that made possible the cult of personality, violations of the law and the arbitrariness and repressions of the 1930s. Bluntly said, these were real crimes based on abuse of power. Many thousands of party and nonparty members were subjected to mass repressions. This, comrades, is the bitter truth. A most severe harm was caused to the cause of socialism and to the party's reputation. We must say this openly. This is necessary in order to ensure the final and irreversible assertion of the Leninist ideal of socialism.

Currently extensive discussions are taking place on the role which Stalin played in our history. His is a very controversial personality. From the positions of historical truth we must see both the unquestionable contribution which Stalin made to the struggle for socialism and the preservation of its gains, as well as the gross political errors and arbitrariness allowed by himself and his retinue, for which our people paid a high price and which had grave consequences for the life of our society. It is sometimes claimed that Stalin was unaware of committed illegalities. The documents at our disposal prove the opposite. The guilt of Stalin and his closest associates for actions against the party and the people for the mass repressions and illegalities which were allowed to occur is tremendous and unforgivable. It is a lesson for all generations.

Naturally, the assertions of our ideological opponents notwithstanding, the cult of personality was not inevitable. It is alien to the nature of socialism and a violation of its fundamental principles and, therefore, has no justification whatsoever. At its 20th and 22nd Congresses the party harshly condemned the cult of Stalin and its consequences. We now know that political accusations and repressions carried out against a number of party and state leaders and many party and nonparty members, economic and military cadres, scientists and men of culture were the result of deliberate forgeries.

Many of the charges were dropped subsequently, particularly after the 20th Party Congress. Thousands of innocent victims were fully exonerated.

However, the process of restoring justice was not brought to completion and was actually halted in the mid-1960s. Today, in accordance with the resolutions of the October 1987 Central Committee Plenum, we must resume it.

The Central Committee Politburo has set up a commission which will comprehensively consider new and already familiar facts and documents related to such matters. Corresponding resolutions will be adopted, based on the results of the commission's work.

All of this will be reflected in the outline on CPSU history, the drafting of which will be assigned to a special Central Committee commission. We must do this, the more so since to this day we come across efforts to avoid sensitive problems of our history, to ignore them, and to pretend as though nothing special had taken place. We cannot agree with this. This would mean scorning historical truth and disrespect for the memory of those who proved to be innocent victims of illegality and arbitrariness. We cannot do this also because a truthful analysis would help us to solve our current problems: democratization, legality, glasnost and elimination of bureaucratism or, in short, the vital problems of restructuring. That is why here as well we need total clarity, precision and consistency (*applause*).

An honest understanding both of our tremendous accomplishments as well as past difficulties and their full and accurate political assessment will give us a real moral guideline for the future (*applause*).

In an overall summation of the 20 to 30 years which passed after Lenin's death, we can say the following: we covered a difficult path, crowded with contradictions and complexities, but also major and heroic. Neither the greatest possible errors nor violations of the principles of socialism could turn our people and country away from the path they took in making their choice in 1917. The impetus provided by the October Revolution was too strong! The ideas of socialism, which had won the masses over, were too powerful! The people felt themselves as participants in a great cause and had begun to benefit from the fruits of their toil. Their patriotism assumed a new, a socialist content (*applause*).

All of this was manifested most strongly during the harsh trials of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945.

Today people in the West are actually discussing the situation which prevailed on the eve of the war. Truths and half-truths become mixed. Particularly zealous are those who are dissatisfied with the results of World War II—political, territorial and social—and who continue to ponder how to change them. That is also why they are interested in turning the truth of history upside-down, in reshuffling the link between cause and effect, and in falsifying chronology. In this context they are resorting to all sorts of lies to blame the Soviet Union for World War II, the road to which was allegedly opened by the Ribbentrop-Molotov nonaggression pact. This question deserves a somewhat more detailed mention.

Actually, by no means did World War II become tragic reality on 1 September 1939. The seizure of Northeastern China by Japan (the "Manchurian incident" of

1931-1932), Italy's attack on Ethiopia (1935) and Albania (spring of 1939), the German-Italian intervention against Republican Spain (1936-1939) and the armed Japanese invasion of Northern and, subsequently, Central China (summer of 1937) were the events which lit the fire of World War II.

There was also the fact that at that time the West was still pretending that this either did not affect it or did not affect it enough to take up the defense of the victims of aggression. Hatred of socialism, settling old scores and class egocentrism prevented a sober assessment of the real danger. Furthermore, fascism was persistently offered the mission of becoming the strike force in the anticommunist crusade. After Ethiopia and China, Austria and Czechoslovakia went into the furnace of "pacification," and the sword hung over Poland and all countries on the Baltic Sea and along the Danube Basin; propaganda was openly mounted of turning the Ukraine into the wheat field and cattle yard of the Third Reich. In the final account, the main trends of aggression were channeled toward the Soviet Union, and since efforts to divide our country had been made long before the war, one can easily imagine how limited our choices were.

It is being said that the decision made by the Soviet Union to sign a nonaggression pact with Germany was not one of the best. This may be so, if we are guided not by rigid reality but by speculative abstractions taken out of the context of the times. Under those circumstances as well, the question would have been roughly as it stood during the time of the Brest peace treaty. Will our country be independent or not, and will there be or will there not be any socialism on earth?

The USSR did a great deal to create a system of collective security and to prevent a global slaughter. The Soviet initiatives, however, met with no response among Western politicians and intriguers who coolly speculated on how more skillfully to involve socialism in a war and in an open conflict with fascism.

Having been rejected because of our socialist origins, under no circumstances could we have been right in the eyes of imperialism. As I already said, the Western ruling circles, in an effort to justify their sins, are trying to convince the people that the starting of the Nazi attack on Poland and, therefore, the outbreak of World War II, was provided by the 23 August 1939 Soviet-German nonaggression pact. This is as though there had been no Munich agreement with Hitler, initiated by Britain and France as early as 1938, with the active support of the United States, or the Austrian Anschluss, the crucifixion of the Republic of Spain, the occupation of Czechoslovakia and Klaypeda by the Nazis, or the 1938 nonaggression pact which London and Paris concluded with Germany. Incidentally, prewar Poland as well had signed such a pact. All of this, as you may see, fully suited the structure of imperialist policy and was and still is considered normal.

Documents prove that the date of Germany's attack against Poland ("no later than 1 September") had been set as early as on 3 April 1939, i.e., long before the Soviet-German pact. London, Paris and Washington were familiar even to the slightest detail of the ins and outs of preparations for the Polish campaign, and of the fact that the only obstacle which could stop the Hitlerites would be the conclusion, no later than August 1939, of an Anglo-Franco-Soviet military alliance. Our country's leadership as well knew of these plans, for which reason it tried to convince England and France of the need to take collective steps. It called for cooperation with the then Polish government as well, with a view to blocking the aggression.

However, the Western powers had different ideas. To tempt the USSR with promises for an alliance and thus prevent the signing of the nonaggression pact which had been offered to us, and to deprive us of the possibility of making better preparations for the inevitable attack on the USSR by Hitlerite Germany. Nor can we forget the fact that in August 1939 the Soviet Union faced the real threat of war on two fronts: on the west with Germany, and on the east with Japan, which had initiated a bloody conflict at the Khalkhin-Gol River.

However, scorning myths, life and death became reality. A new chapter opened, the most difficult and most complex in recent history. At that stage, however, we were able to postpone the clash with the enemy, the type of enemy who left only one choice for itself and his opponent—win or perish.

The aggression which was imposed upon us was a merciless test of the viability of the socialist system, the strength of the multinational Soviet state and of the patriotic spirit of the Soviet people. This test by fire and sword, comrades, we passed! (*sustained applause*).

We passed it because to our people this war became the Great Patriotic War, for in the struggle against an enemy such as German fascism, it was a question of life or death, of living free or being enslaved.

It was passed because the war became a war of the whole people. Everyone rose to the defense of the fatherland: old and young, men and women, and all nations and ethnic groups in the great country. This was the first battle for the generation born of the October Revolution and raised by the socialist system. To us this war was a question of unparalleled firmness and heroism on the battlefields, a courageous struggle waged by the partisans and the underground behind the front line, and almost round-the-clock tireless work in the rear.

The Soviet people fought and worked, defending the homeland, the socialist system and the ideas and cause of the October Revolution. When a tremendous misfortune struck our common home, the Soviet people did not waver or bend either under the strikes of the first failures and defeats or the burden of millions of deaths, pains

and suffering. From the very first day of the war they firmly believed in the future victory. Whether wearing a soldier's overcoat or worker overalls, they did everything possible and impossible to hasten the arrival of this long-awaited day. And when victory came on the 1,418th day of war, the entire rescued world sighed with relief, paying homage to the Soviet people, the winner, the hero and the toiler, and to his valourous army which had covered in battle thousands of kilometers, each one of which cost so many lives, blood and sweat (*applause*).

The talent of outstanding military leaders, who had sprung from the people, was manifested in its entire magnitude in the Great Patriotic War, that of G.K. Zhukov, K.K. Rokossovskiy, A.M. Vasilevskiy, I.S. Konev and other famous marshals, generals and officers, those who commanded fronts, armies, corps, divisions, regiments, battalions, companies and platoons. The tremendous political willpower, purposefulness and persistence, the ability to organize and discipline the people, shown by J.V. Stalin during the war, played a role in this victory. The main burden of the war, however, was carried by the simple Soviet soldier, flesh from the flesh of the people, great toiler, courageous, and loving his fatherland. This is to his great honor and eternal glory! (*sustained applause*).

Millions of Great Patriotic War veterans are still in the ranks, actively participating in revolutionary restructuring and the renovation of society. We express our filial gratitude to them! (*applause*).

Our Leninist Party was the soul of all military and labor accomplishments. Of the front, in the trenches, the communists were the first to rise to the attack, leading the others with their example; in the rear, they were the last to leave their machine tools, fields and livestock farms. More than ever before the Soviet people felt that the VKP(b) was their own party and that the communists were truly proving what it means to be the vanguard of the people, when the flames of war were raging, and when it was a question of life or death.

We can confidently say that the period of the Great Patriotic War was one of the greatest and most heroic pages in the life of the party itself, written with courage and daring and greatest dedication and self-sacrifice of millions of party members (*applause*). The war proved that the Soviet people, the party, socialism and the October Revolution are indivisible and that there is no force on earth which could defeat this unity.

Socialism not only withstood and not only simply won a victory. It came out of a most terrible and destructive war strengthened morally and politically. It increased its authority and influence throughout the world.

When the war ended our enemies predicted our economic decline, the long-term withdrawal of our country from global politics. They believed that we would be unable to deal with the consequences of the war for 50

years or longer. However, within the shortest possible time the Soviet people rebuilt their destroyed cities and villages and raised from the ruins plants and factories, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, schools, VUZs and cultural institutions.

Once again the great strength of the socialist state was manifested: this was the will of the party, motivated by an understanding of the supreme interests of the homeland of the October Revolution; the firmness and proletarian wisdom of the workers, who assumed the main burden of the peaceful reorganization of the country's industrial power and the reconstruction; the dedication, patience and patriotism of the peasantry, which gave its all to feed the wrecked country. And there also was the friendship among the peoples and their mutual aid and readiness jointly, in a fraternal way, to help those who had particularly suffered, and to go to the areas of the common homeland, which had been particularly and mercilessly affected by the war.

The heroism of the labor days of the difficult postwar years is a source of our accomplishments, our economic and scientific and technical progress, mastery of nuclear power, the first launchings of space ships and the growth of the material and cultural prosperity of the people.

At the same time, however, a time of a new popular exploit for the sake of socialism, the contradiction between that which our society had become and the previous methods of management, was becoming increasingly tangible. Abuses of power and violations of socialist legality continued. The "Leningrad trial" and the "doctors' trial" were fabricated. In short, there was a lack of true respect for the people. The people worked and learned with dedication, aspired to new knowledge, tolerated difficulties and shortages but felt that what was developing in society contained both concern and hope. All of this captured the public consciousness soon after Stalin's death.

In the mid-1950s, particularly after the 20th CPSU Congress, a wind of change blew over the country. The people cheered up, came to life and became more daring and confident. Criticizing the cult of personality and its consequences and restoring socialist legality demanded a great deal of courage on the part of the party and its leadership, headed by N.S. Khrushchev. The destruction of the old stereotypes in domestic and foreign policy was undertaken. Efforts were made to eliminate the command-bureaucratic management methods which had become established in the 1930s in 1940s, and to give socialism more dynamism, to underscore humanistic ideals and values and to restore the creative spirit of Leninism in theory and practice.

The resolutions of the September 1953 and July 1955 CPSU Central Committee Plenum were imbued with the aspiration to change priorities in economic development and to introduce incentives related to personal interest

in labor results. Increasing attention began to be paid to the development of agriculture, housing, light industry, the service area and anything related to the satisfaction of human needs.

In short, changes for the better were made both in Soviet society and in international relations. However, a number of subjectivistic errors were made as well, which complicated the advent of the new stage of socialism and also largely compromised progressive initiatives. The point is that qualitatively new tasks in domestic and foreign policy and party building were frequently solved through arbitrary methods, with the help of the old political and economic mechanism. The main reasons for the failure of reforms undertaken at that time, however, were that they were not based on the extensive development of democratization processes.

A change of leadership in the party and country took place at the October 1964 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Resolutions aimed at eliminating voluntaristic trends and shortcuts in domestic and foreign policy were passed. The party tried to achieve a certain stabilization in politics and to give it realistic features and foundations.

The March and September 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenums formulated new approaches to economic management. An economic reform and major programs for developing new areas and production forces were formulated and undertaken. Initially this changed the situation in the country for the better. Economic and scientific potential increased, defense capability strengthened and the well-being of the people improved. Many foreign policy actions were carried out, which strengthened the international reputation of our state, and military-strategic parity with the United States was secured.

The country had great opportunities to ensure the further acceleration in its development. However, in order to apply them, to bring them into action, new radical changes had to be made in society and, naturally, there had to be a necessary political will. Neither were available and even a great deal of that which had been resolved remained on paper only, hanging in the air. The pace of our development slowed down substantially.

The reasons for that situation were frankly described at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the 27th Party Congress; the mechanism which obstructed our development was identified and assessed on a principle-minded basis.

It was emphasized that in the final years of L.I. Brezhnev's life and activities, the search of ways for further progress was greatly held back by an attachment to the habitual formulas and plans which failed to reflect the new realities. The gap between words and actions widened. Negative processes increased in the economy, creating an essentially pre-crisis situation. A number of

anomalous phenomena appeared in the social and spiritual-moral areas, which distorted the principles of socialist justice, undermined the people's faith in it and triggered social alienation and immorality in a variety of forms. The growing disparity between the lofty principles of socialism and the daily realities of life became intolerable.

The healthy forces in the party and in society increasingly felt the urgent need and necessity to surmount negative phenomena, halt the development of events, ensure the accelerated socioeconomic development of the country and achieve the moral cleansing and renovation of socialism.

The concept and strategy of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, and the course of renovation of socialism, which were theoretically and politically developed in the resolutions of the 27th Congress and the subsequent Central Committee Plenums, and which became the general line in revolutionary restructuring of all aspects of life in socialist society, were the answers to this most pressing social need.

The idea of restructuring is based on our 70-year old history. It rests on the firm foundations of an essentially new socialist structure erected in the land of the soviets, combining continuity with innovation and the historical experience of bolshevism with the contemporary nature of socialism. We must continue and multiply the achievements of those who pioneered the revolution and socialism. We shall achieve this without fail, making creative use of the experience of the generations which laid the road from the October Revolution to us and for us! (*applause*).

Comrades! We are following a revolutionary path which is not for the weak and the timid; it is the path of the strong and daring. Such have always been the Soviet people, during years of the greatest social changes, the trials of the war, and peaceful constructive toil. It is precisely the people who make their own history and destinies, in an always complex yet unique and priceless way, like human life itself. This applies a hundred times more when it becomes a question of the history of socialism and of continuing the cause of the Great Revolution.

The working class was and remains the binding and vanguard force of the people. At the very dawn of the revolutionary movement it followed Lenin's appeal: "Fight for freedom, without abandoning for a single minute the thought of socialism, and work for attaining it and for preparing the forces and the organization needed for acquiring socialism" (op cit., vol 10, p 283). It was precisely the working class, allied with all working people, that made the Great October Revolution, built socialism, and defended it in most severe battles with the enemy. It withstood, it experienced and it endured

everything; to this day it is in the vanguard of developing socialism and revolutionary restructuring. Glory and great honor to it! (*sustained applause*).

Our Leninist Party appeared and developed as the active combat detachment of the working class. It took from it its powerful confidence, firmness, discipline, endurance in the struggle for the ideals of socialism and a wise and humane understanding of life. Now, as the party of the entire people, it has preserved these best features of the attacking and creating class. This applies to the present and to all stages in the history of socialism! (*applause*).

The main, the determining meaning of our history is that for these entire 70 years our people lived and worked under the party's leadership in the name of socialism and for the sake of a better and more just life. This is the fate of a people-creator, a people-builder! (*applause*).

II. Developing Socialism and Restructuring

Comrades! Pressing and urgent needs led us to conclude that restructuring was necessary. However, the more profoundly we studied our problems and understood their meaning, the clearer it became that restructuring also has a broader sociopolitical and historical context.

Restructuring means not only eliminating the stagnation and conservatism of the preceding period and correcting the errors which were made, but also surmounting historically limited and obsolete features of the organization of society and of work methods. It means ascribing to socialism the most advanced forms consistent with the conditions and needs of the scientific and technical revolution and the intellectual progress of Soviet society. It is a relatively lengthy process of the revolutionary renovation of society, with its own logic and stages.

According to Lenin, the historical task of socialism was to prepare a transition to communism after long years of work (see op cit., vol 44, p 151). The leader of the revolution highly valued Marx's and Engels' ability "to analyze...with exceptional thoroughness precisely the transitional forms in order to take into consideration, based on specific historical characteristics of each individual case, the nature of transition of any specific transitional form" (op cit., vol 33, p 72). In short, our teachers repeatedly cautioned that the road to follow in building a new society is a long series of transitions.

We would be fully justified in looking at restructuring as a certain historical stage in the progress of our society. In answering Lenin's question "*from what to what*," we must say quite definitely that we must give socialism a new quality, a second breath, as the saying goes, and in order to achieve this, we need a profound renovation of all aspects of social life, material as well spiritual, and bring to light to the greatest extent the humanistic nature of our system.

The purpose of restructuring is to restore in full, theoretically and practically, the Leninist concept of socialism in which the absolute priority is that of the working person with his ideals, and interests, and humanistic values in economics, in social and political relations and in culture.

Our hope for a revolutionary cleansing and revival is to bring to light the tremendous social resources of socialism by enhancing the individual, the human factor. As a result of restructuring, socialism can and must realize in full its opportunities as a system of real humanism, serving and ennobling man. It is a society for people, for the blossoming of their creative toil, well-being, health, and physical and moral development, a society in which man will consider himself as the full owner and will be such in fact.

Two key problems in the development of society determine the fate of restructuring: democratization of all social life and a radical economic reform.

In continuing the cause of the October Revolution, restructuring formulated as the priority task the further intensification and development of socialist democracy. The democratization of society is the heart of restructuring and its development will determine the success of restructuring itself and, one would say without exaggeration, the future of socialism as a whole. It is the firmest guarantee for changes in politics and economics, which would exclude any backward movement.

The changes which are taking place in the country today are, since the October Revolution, the longest step on the way to the development of socialist democracy.

As we restructure our economic and political system, we must begin, first of all, by creating a reliable and flexible mechanism for the actual involvement of all working people in the solution of governmental and social affairs. Second, we must teach the people to live under conditions of increased democracy. We must expand and strengthen human rights and develop a contemporary political standard in the masses. In other words, we must teach and learn democracy.

In celebrating the 70th anniversary of our revolution and thinking of the future, we must take a close look at the development of the process of the democratization of society, and what is hindering it. Difficulties and contradictions here are numerous and sometimes unexpected; there is a struggle between the new and progressive and the old and obsolete. There is a certain uncertainty and indecisiveness.

In the first days after the October Revolution, Lenin noted that workers and peasants were still "slaving," they were still insufficiently decisive; they had not accepted that it was they precisely who must take in their own hands all levers of control. "However, this precisely is the strength, the vitality and the invincibility of the

October Revolution of 1917," Lenin wrote: "The fact that it awakens such qualities, removing all the old obstacles, eliminating obsolete ways and leading the working people to the road of *independent* creation of a new life" (op cit., vol 35, p 199).

Today as well we see how difficult it is for the people to accept the situation and the possibility and need to live and solve all problems through democratic methods. Many of them are still "slaving," acting cautiously, fearing to assume responsibility, still trapped by obsolete regulations and instructions. The task is to develop in the people a taste for independence and responsibility in approaching production and social affairs on any scale, and to develop self-government as the power of the people, exercised by the people themselves and in their own interest.

The development of self-government will take place above all through the soviets which, in accordance with the party's plans, must fully justify their role as representative and deciding authorities. Of late the rights and possibilities of the soviets on all levels have been substantially broadened. This process will be continued further. This means that the soviets will gather strength and Soviet democracy will intensify.

We have undertaken to improve the electoral system. Last elections proved to us the accuracy and fruitfulness of the new approaches. They indicated the increased political activeness of the people and their interest in electing to the soviets the truly best representatives of the working people, although here as well there were cases of formalism and excessive organization.

Restructuring and the development of democracy enable us to include the full energy, possibilities and rights of trade unions, the Komsomol and the other public organizations, including some which have appeared in recent years, such as the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans, the women's councils, the Soviet Cultural Foundation, and the Children's Foundation imeni V.I. Lenin. It is important for their daily activities to be related to the solution of vitally important problems and to reflect the interests of the broad toiling masses.

A great deal of new and encouraging features have appeared in the labor collectives and in residential areas. Extensive scope is being provided for useful initiative, for solving all vital problems efficiently, without red tape.

The new processes which have developed in the country also reformulate questions of general, political and legal knowledge and, I would say, of the standards of socialist democracy. It was precisely the lack of such standards that was largely the reason for vices such as bureaucracy and abuse of power, subservience, irresponsibility and negligence. The true standard of socialist democracy

will not accept any command "pressure" style or organizational slackness or else replacing action with meaningless talk. Both are alien to socialism. Equally unquestionable is something else: the broader and deeper democracy becomes, the more attention will have to be paid to socialist legality and order and the more we shall need organization and conscious discipline.

A democratic standard cannot be limited to politics. It must imbue all areas of human relations. We proceed from the fact that socialism is a society of growing variety in judgment, interrelationships and human activities. Every person has his own social experience, level of knowledge, education and ways of perceiving events. Hence the tremendous range of opinions, views and beliefs which, naturally, require careful consideration and comparison. We favor a variety of public opinions and a rich spiritual life. We should not fear openly to formulate and solve the difficult problems of social development, to criticize and to argue. It is precisely under these circumstances that the truth is born and leads to accurate decisions. Socialist democracy must be entirely at the service of socialism and the interest of the working people (*applause*).

Comrades! A firm foundation for accelerated projects in all directions can be created only on the basis of radical changes in the economy. Restructuring itself will reach its full strength only when it has profoundly shaken up the national economy. In turn, this is based on profound changes in the economic mechanism and in the entire economic management system.

The purpose of the radical economic reform initiated in the country is to ensure in the next 2 to 3 years a transition from an excessively centralized command-based system of management to a democratic system, resting essentially on economic methods and on the optimal combination of centralism with self-government. It presumes a drastic expansion of the autonomy of associations and enterprises, their conversion to full cost accounting and self-financing, and granting the labor collectives all the necessary rights to this effect.

The economic reform no longer consists solely of plans and intentions, and even less so of abstract theoretical considerations. It is firmly and profoundly becoming part of life. Today a considerable number of associations and enterprises in industry, construction, transportation and agriculture are working on the basis of self-financing and self-support. Starting with 1988, enterprises accounting for 60 percent of the industrial output will operate under the same conditions. The Law on the State Enterprise (Association) will be enacted.

All of this is already affecting economic management practices. The collectives are showing a substantially increased interest in financial and economic results of their work. They are beginning truly to take into consideration outlays and results, to save in major and minor matters and to find the most efficient ways of solving

problems. Today, once more, we must firmly repeat that the party will allow no violation of the adopted economic reform principles. All planned changes must and will be implemented in full.

The economic reform and restructuring as a whole actively give priority to the person. For the sake of social justice we must pay greater attention to the manifestation of individual capabilities and take note, both morally and materially, of those who work better and more and who set an example for others.

Real talent and outstanding individuals are the priceless wealth of society and we must be concerned about them and provide them with all the necessary conditions for creative work and life. We want to promote universal respect for the dignity, knowledge, labor and capabilities of everyone. Every honest, working and creative person should be confident that his work will be properly rated, that he can always prove his rightness and have our support while the idler, the loafer, the bureaucrat and the lout will be put in his place and exposed. The positive changes which are taking place in our country in this respect, extensively covered by the mass information media, are warmly supported by the working people.

An unconscientious attitude toward the work is particularly intolerable today. A person equipped with modern knowledge and technology increases his output further and further, and his work becomes increasingly dependent on the activities of thousands of other participants in public production. Under said circumstances the carelessness of even a single worker, engineer or scientist could have exceptionally serious consequences fraught with tremendous losses to society.

Let us particularly emphasize the growing importance of intellectual labor, of the interaction among science, technology and society, and the humanistic, moral and ethical trend in science and scientific and technical progress. We favor all achievements of science and technology to be put on the service of man and not result in disturbances of the ecological environment. We are learning harsh lessons from a tragic event, such as the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. We are in favor of putting an end to the use of science for military purposes. Today the duty of the engineer, scientist, physician, teacher and man of literature and the arts is to upgrade his social responsibility, professional competence and creative returns (*applause*).

In restoring the material incentive of workers, while paying attention to its collective forms, we must not allow the underestimating of sociocultural and moral-psychological incentives. They are exceptionally important in the normal development of relations of collectivism, comradeship and socialist way of life and in strengthening our Soviet values in the minds and behavior of the people.

Comrades! We justly say that we have solved the national problem. The revolution laid a path not only to the legal but also to the socioeconomic equality of nations, having accomplished inordinately much in equalizing the economic, social and cultural development of all republics and areas and of all peoples. One of the greatest accomplishments of the October Revolution is the friendship among the Soviet peoples. In itself, this is a unique phenomenon in world history. To us it is one of the main supports of the power and strength of the Soviet state (*applause*).

Today, as we note the outstanding accomplishments of the Leninist national policy, the peoples of our country pay their profound respect and show their gratitude to the great Russian people for their selflessness, true internationalism and invaluable contribution to the creation, development and strengthening of the socialist union of free and equal republics and the economic, social and cultural progress of all peoples in the land of the soviets (*applause*).

Comrades, we shall protect our great common gain—the friendship of the peoples of the USSR (*applause*). That is why we shall never forget that we live in a multinational state in which all socioeconomic, cultural and legal decisions always directly and immediately affect the national problem as well. We shall act like Leninists: by maximally developing the potential of each ethnic group and each Soviet people (*applause*).

National relations in our country are a live concern. We must show extreme caution and tactfulness about anything affecting the national interests or national feelings of the people. We must ensure the most active participation of the working people of all nations and ethnic groups in solving the various problems of life in our multinational society. We intend to analyze and discuss such problems more profoundly in the immediate future, taking into consideration what restructuring, democratization and the new stage in the development of the country bring to its life.

To us friendship and cooperation among the peoples of the USSR is sacred. Such was the case in the past and such shall it be in the future. This is consistent with the spirit of Leninism, the traditions of the Great October Revolution and the basic interests of all nations and ethnic groups inhabiting our homeland (*sustained applause*).

Comrades! The conversion of Soviet society to a qualitatively new status and a thrust into the future can be accomplished only on a broad front which includes the spiritual area of socialism—science, education, literature and the arts, the totality of social and moral values of the Soviet people. Spiritual culture is not an adornment of society but part of its life support, of the intellectual and cultural potential of society. It is an alloying factor for its social strength and a catalyst for its dynamic nature.

We must enhance even further the prestige of socialist culture. Scientists, inventors, writers, journalists, painters, actors and teachers—anyone working in the various areas of culture and education—must be a fighter for restructuring. The party is relying on the active civic and social stance of our intelligentsia (*applause*).

The Soviet people have become an educated people, something which the great educators of the past could only dream about. However, here as well complacency is forbidden. Our accomplishments should not conceal the vast and responsible problems which must be solved today. We see that the educational system has become largely unable to meet modern requirements. The quality of training in schools and VUZs and the training of workers and specialists by no means meet the full requirements of life.

A major leap forward must be made and radical changes achieved in this area as well. That is precisely the way the party approaches the reform in secondary and vocational training and the restructuring of higher schools. The CPSU Central Committee has decided to consider the pressing problems of education at one of its plenums.

Such are, comrades, our strategic problems which we must solve in the course of the revolutionary restructuring of all aspects of life in socialist society.

Two and one half years have passed since the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum. What have we been able to accomplish? What level have we reached? I believe that these questions are both pertinent and unavoidable at this solemn session.

The general conclusion of the recently ended CPSU Central Committee Plenum is the following: we have reached a turning point. Essentially, the first stage of work on restructuring has been completed. The concept of restructuring was formulated on the basis of a profound study of the situation and the future development of the country. A new political and moral-psychological atmosphere has been created. The party was able to increase the interest of the people in social affairs and their activeness, to raise the level of exigency, criticism and self-criticism and glasnost, and to create prerequisites for real changes in the thoughts and feelings of the people.

The main factor which determines the stance of the majority of Soviet people at this stage is support of restructuring, the demand for its steadfast progress. Workers, kolkhoz members and intellectuals understand the need to improve discipline, efficiency and the quality of labor. At plants, construction sites, kolkhozes, sovkhoses and scientific research organizations intensive search is under way for new forms of labor organization and wages. Today the people are becoming more exigent toward themselves and toward managers and specialists and decisively oppose irresponsibility and negligence.

We highly value this civic stance taken by the working people, considering it an unquestionable and strong support of the party's course of restructuring.

There are also reasons to mention some positive changes in practical accomplishments, above all in the socioeconomic sphere. The growth rates of output have increased. Quality changes have been noted in the economy, the greatest possible scientific and technical programs are being implemented and domestic machine building is being modernized. Agriculture, animal husbandry in particular, has begun to develop more stably.

All of you, comrades, know the adverse weather conditions which prevailed this year in most parts of the country. Nonetheless, we were able to harvest a grain crop in excess of 210 million tons. This is the result of the tremendous efforts of our people and the party who led them to work in a new fashion! (*applause*).

The initiated improvements in the economy enabled us to undertake the implementation of major steps in the social area. The scale of housing construction has increased noticeably. The service industry is expanding and the income of the working people is growing. Wages of teachers and physicians have been raised. Major programs are being implemented in education and medical services to the population.

Nonetheless, this is merely the beginning. Today we can speak of entering a new stage in restructuring, when our entire policy and all our decisions are being converted into specific actions and implemented. This demands the tremendous efforts of the entire people—the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, and all our cadres. Life itself will now test our ideas, plans and approaches and work methods.

We feel in everything today the growing tension of life. However, this is the tension of creativity, active labor and political and intellectual efforts. This is a good tension, comrades, a mobilizing one!

We should emphasize that from this viewpoint the next 2 or perhaps 3 years will be the most difficult and decisive and, in a certain sense, critical. This is above all because of the need simultaneously to solve major problems in the economy, the social area and the restructuring of state and social management, in ideology and in culture.

In the area of economics profound structural changes must be made. We must achieve an upturn in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and complete in its essential line the restructuring of the economic mechanism and thus take a decisive step in shifting the national economy to the track of intensification.

The difficulty of the forthcoming period lies also in the fact that the changes will affect the interests of increasing masses of people, social groups and population strata, and all cadres. We are confident that the situation in the country will continue to encourage the continuing broad support of the working people in restructuring and that their profound understanding of the need for change and energetic continuation of restructuring despite certain difficulties along this way.

However, it would be an error not to see a certain increase in the opposition by conservative forces, who consider restructuring a threat to their selfish interests and objectives. This is manifested not only in some management units but also in labor collectives. It is hardly doubtful that the forces of conservatism will not use any difficulty in their efforts to discredit restructuring and trigger the discontent of the working people. Already now some show a preference for keeping score of blunders instead of, rolling up their sleeves, fight shortcomings and seek new solutions. Naturally, in this case no one claims to be against restructuring. No, they present themselves as fighters against its faults and promoters of ideological foundations which may be weakened by the growing activeness of the masses.

But to what extent, comrades, could all kinds of blunders frighten us! Naturally, blunders are inevitable in any project, and even more so in a new one. However, the consequences of marking time, stagnation and indifference are much worse and more costly than those which may appear for a certain time in the course of the creative establishment of new forms of social life.

We must learn how to identify, put in their place and neutralize the maneuvers of the opponents of restructuring, those who hinder the work, who put spokes in wheels, who gloat over difficulties and failures and who try to pull us back into the past. Nor should we yield to the pressure of those who are excessively zealous and impatient, those who are unwilling to take the objective logic of restructuring into consideration, who show their displeasure with what they consider the slow pace of change, or the fact that it is allegedly not yielding quickly the necessary results. It must be made clear that we must not skip stages and try to do everything in one fell swoop.

Restructuring continues the cause of the revolution. Today the ability to master to perfection the weapon of revolutionary restraint is extremely necessary. This restraint does not consist of marking time or swimming along with the current. It lies in the ability realistically to assess the situation, not to remain idle in the face of difficulties, not to panic and not to lose one's head by success or failure but to retain the ability to work every day and every hour and everywhere with stress and purpose, and to find for everything and to implement optimal decisions as dictated by life itself (*applause*).

Hence the need for confident, persistent and purposeful work for the implementation of that which we have planned, for achieving our objectives and tasks. We must identify and analyze contradictions. We must understand their nature and, on this basis, formulate a system of political, economic, social, organizational and ideological measures. Such, and no other, should our approach be! (*applause*).

Comrades! The success of restructuring depends above all on the energy, purposefulness and forcefulness of the example set by the party and every party member. In this historically responsible moment of socioeconomic change, the Communist Party has mounted a bold and decisive struggle for the renovation of society. It has assumed the most difficult burden of the work. We can confidently say that the great cause of the October Revolution—the cause of revolutionary restructuring—is in firm hands. The communists will fulfill their duty with a high feeling of responsibility to the people and their time (*sustained applause*).

Radical improvements in the activities of party organizations, party agencies and cadres are becoming the main task of today. We must achieve an upturn in the activities of all party organizations and enhance the work of each party committee and every party member. Wherever this has been accomplished, wherever the party leaders and party members have awakened the initiative and activity of the masses and daringly taken the path of democratization and glasnost, the use of cost accounting and collective contracting and given scope to new forms of labor organization and incentives and to satisfying the needs of the people, matters have progressed decisively. We see, however, that in many cities, rayons and oblasts and even in some entire republics restructuring has not as yet truly developed. This is the direct result of political and organizational sluggishness and lack of initiative on the part of party committees and their leaders. This too we must see. This too is part of our reality.

The primary party organizations bear particular responsibility for improving matters. It is essentially within them that all threads of restructuring come together. It is precisely on the initiative of the primary party organizations that the course of change, the ability to mobilize and inspire the people and to achieve specific improvements in the work depend above all. Generally speaking, comrades, we cannot accomplish restructuring without drastically enhancing the activities of all party organizations. For that reason we need more efficiency, democracy, organization and discipline. It is at that point that we shall be able to launch restructuring at full speed and provide new impetus to developing socialism (*applause*).

III. The Great October and the Contemporary World

Comrades! The world would not have been as we see it now had there not been the Great Revolution in Russia. Until that turn in world history the “right” of the strong

and the rich as well as wars of conquest were the ordinary standard of international relations. The Soviet system, the first legislative act of which was the famous Decree on Peace, mounted a struggle against such an order of things. The land of the soviets introduced in international practice that which previously was outside the realm of “big politics:” the good common sense of the people and the interests of the toiling masses.

During the short period of time when Soviet foreign policy was headed by Lenin, he not only formulated its starting principles but also showed how to apply them under most unusual and drastically changing circumstances. In fact, despite the initial expectations, the break of the “weakest link” in the capitalist system did not mark the “final decisive battle” but the beginning of a lengthy and difficult process.

One of the greatest accomplishments of the founder of the Soviet state was his ability to realize promptly the real prospects which opened to the new Russia as a result of the victorious ending of the civil war. In his thinking, the country was able to acquire not only a “breathing spell” but something much greater, “a new time, in which our basic international existence within the network of capitalist states has been reconquered” (op cit., vol 42, p 22). Lenin decisively suggested a course of learning the long “cohabitation” with it. Contrary to left-wing extremism, he substantiated the possibility of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

It took no more than 18 months to 2 years after the civil war to break the foreign political isolation of the worker-peasant state. Treaties were concluded with neighboring countries, followed by Germany in Rapallo. The Soviet Republic was diplomatically recognized by Britain, France, Italy, Sweden and other capitalist countries. The first steps were taken in establishing equal relations with oriental countries: China, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan.

All of these are not simply the first victories of Leninist foreign policy and diplomacy. They meant that an essentially new type of international development had been attained. The major direction of our international policy was laid, which we justifiably described as the Leninist course of peace, mutually profitable cooperation among countries and friendship among nations.

Naturally, not all of our subsequent work in foreign policy was a string of successes and accomplishments. Errors were made as well. Opportunities were not always and fully used, both before and after World War II. We were unable to make use of the tremendous moral prestige with which the Soviet Union came out of the war in order to consolidate the peace-loving and democratic forces and halt the organizers of the cold war. Our reaction to provocative imperialist actions was not always adequate.

Yes, some things could have been done better and we could have acted more efficiently. Nonetheless, in this solemn hour we can say that invariably the main line of our policy followed the general trend which was formulated and laid by Lenin, i.e., a trend consistent with the nature of socialism and its main orientation toward peace (*applause*).

It was to a decisive extent precisely thanks to this that we were able to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war and not allow imperialism to win the cold war. Together with our allies we defeated the imperialist strategy of "rejection of socialism." Imperialism was forced to moderate its aspirations to world rule. In the new stage, we were able to rely precisely on the results of our peaceful policy in formulating new approaches in the spirit of a new type of thinking.

Naturally, the Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence experienced changes. Initially, it was based above all on the need to create minimal external conditions for building the new society in the country of the socialist revolution. As an extension of the class policy of the victorious proletariat, however, subsequently and particularly in the nuclear age, peaceful coexistence became a prerequisite for the survival of all mankind.

The April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum was another level reached in the development of Leninist thinking in this area. The 27th Congress provided an expanded presentation of the new foreign policy concept. Its starting point, as we know, is the following idea: despite the profoundly contradictory nature of the contemporary world and basic differences among the countries within it, it is interrelated and interdependent and is, to a certain extent, integral.

This is based on the internationalization of global economic relations, the comprehensive nature of the scientific and technical revolution, the essentially new role played by information and communication media, the condition of the resources on the planet, the common ecological danger, and the crying social problems of the developing world, which affect everyone. Above all, it is the appearance of the problem of the survival of the human species, for the appearance and threat of use of nuclear weapons have questioned its very existence.

It is thus that Lenin's idea of the priority of the interests of social development has assumed a new meaning and significance.

Starting with the April Plenum, we expressed with sufficient clarity the way in which we conceive of this advance toward a safe and strong peace. Our intentions and our will are codified in the resolutions of the supreme party political forum, the 27th Congress, the new draft of the CPSU program, the program for nuclear disarmament, outlined in the 15 January 1986 and New Delhi declarations and other documents, and in the official speeches by Soviet leaders.

Together with the members of the socialist community we submitted to the United Nations a number of major initiatives including a draft for the establishment of a comprehensive system for international peace and security. The Warsaw Pact members turned to NATO and to all European countries with the suggestion of reducing armed forces and armaments to the level of reasonable sufficiency. We have called for a comparison between the military doctrines of the two alliances with a view to making them exclusively defensive. We have submitted a specific plan and are actively working for the banning and destruction of chemical weapons. We have shown initiative in the organization of efficient means of verifying reductions in armaments, including on-site inspection.

We have firmly called for strengthening the authority of the United Nations and the full and efficient use of its rights and its international agencies. We are doing everything we can for the UN—this universal mechanism—to be empowered to discuss and ensure a collective way of balancing the interests of all countries and efficiently exercising its peace-making functions.

The most important thing is for our concept and firm support of peace to be reflected in our actions and our entire behavior in the international arena and in the very style of foreign policy and diplomacy, imbued with the desire for dialogue—open and honest, taking into consideration reciprocal concerns and the conclusions of global science, without attempts at taking advantage of or deceiving anyone. Therefore, after more than 2.5 years, we can confidently say that the new style of political thinking is not simply a statement or an appeal but a philosophy of action, a philosophy of life, if you wish. It is continuing to develop along with the course of objective processes in the world and is already working.

The October 1986 Reykjavik meeting is one of the events of the beginning new stage in international development, worth noting today and which will remain in the annals of history. It instilled practical energy to the new style of thinking and made possible its strengthening in a great variety of social and political circles and made international political contacts more efficient.

The new style of thinking, with its universal human criteria and orientation toward reason and openness, has begun to work its way in world affairs, bringing down the stereotypes of anti-Sovietism and suspicion of our initiatives and actions.

Naturally, if we weigh this with the scale of the problems which contemporary mankind must resolve in order to ensure its survival, very, very little has been accomplished as yet. However, the beginning has been laid and the first indications of change are apparent. A convincing proof of this is the agreement reached with the United States on concluding in the immediate future an accord on medium-range and tactical missiles.

The conclusion of such an accord is of great significance in itself: for the first time an entire class of nuclear armaments will be eliminated and a first real step will be taken toward the elimination of nuclear arsenals. It would prove in fact that progress in that direction is possible to no one's detriment.

Unquestionably, this is an important success for the new style of thinking. It is the fruit of our readiness, strictly observing the principle of equal security, to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

However, the question of such an accord was essentially solved already in Reykjavik, in the course of our second meeting with the President.

The world expects from the third and fourth encounters between high officials of the USSR and the United States, during such an important time, more than simply the ratification of what was agreed upon a year ago and not only a continuation of the discussion. We are urged on by time, by the growing threat of the improvement of weapons which could come out of control.

That is why we shall persistently strive to achieve tangible changes in these meetings, and specific results on the key problem of lifting the nuclear threat: the problem of reducing strategic offensive weapons and preventing the deployment of weapons in space.

Nonetheless, what are our reasons for optimism, for believing that comprehensive security is truly possible? It is worth considering this at greater length.

As we celebrate the 70th anniversary of our revolution, which would not have won had it not been prepared theoretically, today as well, at the new turning point in universal history, we are formulating the theoretical prospects for progress toward a stable peace. Applying the new style of thinking, we have essentially substantiated the need for and possibility of a comprehensive system of international security under conditions of disarmament. We must now prove the need and the reality of advancing toward and reaching this objective. We must determine the laws governing the interaction among forces which, in the course of struggle, contradictions and conflicts of interests, could yield the desired results. In this connection as well, and again on the basis of our Leninist theory and use of its methodology, we must above all ask ourselves some difficult questions.

The first applies to the nature of imperialism for, as we know, the main threat of war is rooted in it. Naturally, the nature of a social system cannot be changed under the influence of external conditions but at the present stage in global developments, on the new level of interdependence and integrity of the world, is such an influence on this nature, such as to block its most dangerous manifestations, possible? In other words, could we rely on the fact that the laws governing the integral world in

which universal values have the main priority, could limit the range of destructive actions by egocentric and narrow-class laws governing the capitalist system?

The second question is linked to the first: Is capitalism able to free itself from militarism? Could it economically function and develop without it? Is our invitation to the Western countries to draft and compare programs for economic reconversion, i.e., for converting it to a peaceful track, utopian? The third question is the following: Could the capitalist system do without neocolonialism, which is one of the sources of its present life support? In other words, is that system able to function without nonequivalent trade with the Third World, which is fraught with unpredictable consequences?

Along with them is yet another question: How realistic is the hope that an awareness of the catastrophic danger threatening the world, an awareness which, we know, is reaching even the upper echelons of the ruling elite of the Western world, will convert to practical policy? However strong the arguments of the mind may be, and however strongly developed may be the feeling of responsibility or powerful the instinct of self-preservation, there are things which should not be underestimated in the least and which are determined by economic and, consequently, also by class interests.

In other words, the question is, will capitalism be able to adapt to the conditions of a nuclear-free and disarmed world, the conditions of a new just economic order, the conditions of an honest comparison between the spiritual values of the two worlds? These are by no means meaningless questions. The answer to them will determine the development of historical events in the forthcoming decades.

However, suffice it to raise even a single one of these questions to realize the entire seriousness of the task. Answers will be provided by life. The rightness of the program itself for a nuclear-free and safe world will be determined not only with its impeccable scientific substantiation. It will be tested by the course of events which are subject to the influence of a great variety of both extant and new forces.

It is already being tested. Here as well we are loyal to the Leninist tradition, to the very essence of Leninism, namely, the organic blending of theory with practice, the approach to theory as an instrument of practice and to practice as the control mechanism for the accuracy of theory. It is precisely thus that we act in interpreting the new way of thinking in foreign policy, correcting and refining it with the experience gained from realpolitik.

Therefore, what are we relying on, knowing that we shall have to build a safe world together with the capitalist countries?

The postwar period has given us proof that the contradictions which determined the main processes in global economics and politics have changed substantially. I am referring above all to a type of their development which in the past inevitably led to war, to world wars among capitalist countries themselves.

Today the situation is different. Not only the lessons of the last war but also the fear of becoming weaker than socialism, which has become a global system, do not allow capitalism to reach extremes in its internal contradictions. Such contradictions were turned into a technological race and "diluted" with the help of neocolonialism. A kind of new, a "peaceful" redivision of the world occurred, observing the rule discovered by Lenin: "according to capital," i.e., those who at any given time are richer and stronger also get the bigger share. In a number of countries economic stress began to be "reduced" by transferring funds to the military-industrial complex, under the pretext of the "Soviet threat." The changes which have taken place in the technological and organizational foundations of the capitalist economy have also contributed to smoothen contradictions and to balance interests.

But there is more to it. Whereas in the past, the alliance between socialist and capitalist countries became possible in the face of the fascist menace, should this not teach a certain lesson for the present, when the entire world is facing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, and for the need to ensure a safe nuclear industry and surmount the ecological danger? These are all entirely real and terrible things which must not only be realized but which also demand a search for practical solutions.

But let us go on. Could the capitalist economy develop without militarization? At this point what comes to mind is the "economic miracles" of Japan, West Germany and Italy. It is true that when the "miracle" ended, they once again turned to militarism. However, we should establish the extent to which this turn was caused by the essential laws governing the functioning of contemporary monopoly capital and the role which was played by related circumstances: the "contagious example" of the U.S. military-industrial complex, the cold war situation, considerations of prestige, the need for one's own "military fist" in order to speak with one's competitors in a language understood in those circles, and the desire to back one's economic invasion of the Third World with power policy. Whatever the case, in a number of countries a period of rapid development of the contemporary capitalist economy with minimal military expenditures took place. Its experience as well has become part of history.

The same question could be tackled from the opposite side. Since war times the U.S. economy has been invariably oriented toward and based on militarism. Initially this seemed to stimulate it. Subsequently, however, such a waste of resources, useless and unnecessary to society, turned into an astronomically high national debt and

entailed other difficulties and faults. It turned out that, in the final account, supermilitarization leads to a growing aggravation of the situation within that country itself and disturbs the economies of other countries. The recent panic on the New York and other other difficulties and faults. It turned out that, in the final account, stock markets throughout the world, unprecedented for nearly 60 years, is a serious symptom, a serious warning.

The third aspect is that of nonequivalent, of exploitative relations with developing countries. Despite all fantastic innovations in the area of developing a "second" (artificial) nature, developed capitalism could not and will not be able to do without the resources of those countries. Such is objective reality.

Reliance on the rejection of historically developed global economic ties is dangerous and will provide no solution. However, the use of foreign resources through the application of neocolonialist methods, the arbitrariness of multinational corporations, enslaving indebtedness and debts in the trillions, obviously unpayable, will also lead nowhere. This triggers major problems within the capitalist countries themselves. There are more than enough speculations on this matter. Essentially, their purpose is to make the Third World a scapegoat for many difficulties, including the declining living standard in the mother countries of capitalism. Efforts are being made to "unite the nation" on a chauvinistic basis, to involve the working people in a "partnership" in exploiting other countries and, at the same time, make them accept the policy of a new capitalist modernization. However, no such or other tricks could solve the problem itself. They can only occasionally and temporarily suppress it. Nonequivalent trade remains and, in the final account, leads to explosion. The Western leaders seem to be beginning to understand the likelihood of such an outcome. For the time being, they are looking for solutions in a variety of palliatives.

Indeed, the novelty of current international economic and political processes has still not been fully realized and accepted. However, this will be necessary, for the developing processes have the power of an objective law. It will be either a collapse or a joint search for a new economic order which would take into consideration, on an equal footing, the interests of all. As we conceive it now, the way to establish such an order is that of the implementation of the concept of "disarmament for the sake of development."

Therefore, in seeking an answer to our third question we see that the situation is not insoluble. Here as well contradictions can be modified. However, this calls for understanding the existing reality and structure practical actions in the spirit of the new way of thinking. In turn, this will facilitate progress toward a safer world. In short, here as well, a historical choice can be made, dictated by the laws of a largely interdependent and integral world.

Another most important and even decisive circumstance exists. Socialism is a structural part of this world. Having started its history 70 years ago and, subsequently, having become a global system, it determined the shape of the 20th century. Today it is reaching a new stage in its development, once again demonstrating its possibilities.

For example, one could imagine the tremendous opportunities for peaceful coexistence found simply in the restructuring in the Soviet Union. By allowing us to reach world standards in all most important economic indicators, it would enable a huge and extremely rich country to become more than ever before part of the global division of labor and resources. Its great scientific, technical and production potential will account for a substantially higher share of global economic relations. This will decisively broaden and strengthen the material base of the comprehensive system of peace and international security. Such, incidentally, is yet another most important aspect of restructuring and of its place in the destinies of contemporary civilization.

The class struggle and the other manifestations of social contradictions will influence objective processes in favor of peace.

The progressive forces within the labor movement are seeking ways for the enhancement of its political standard. They are obliged to act under very complex new and changing circumstances. Not only the questions of protecting the economic rights and interests of the masses but also the struggle for democracy, including democracy at the workplace, have been reformulated. For example, workers are frequently offered a "partnership," but the type of partnership which tightly blocks access to the holy of hollies of business, in which there could not even be a question of the free choice of managerial personnel.

The Western world is full of "theories" according to which the working class will disappear, it has become totally diluted within the "middle class," or has become socially regenerated, and so on, and so forth. Yes, major and essential differences have occurred within the working class. However, it is in vain that the class enemy is lulling itself and is trying to disorient, to confuse the labor movement. Today, in its new social boundaries, the working class is a numerically predominant force and has the potential to play a decisive role, and even more so at sharp historical turns.

Its motivations may be different. One of the likely ones is the insane militarization of the economy. The conversion to a new phase of the technological revolution on a militaristic basis is a strong catalyst, the more so since this is a path leading to war and therefore affecting all population strata, extending the boundaries of mass protest beyond economic demands. Therefore, here as well the ruling class, the owners of monopoly capital, will have to make a choice. We are convinced, as confirmed by science, that given the present level of technology and

organization of the production process a reconversion, a demilitarization of the economy, is possible. This would also be a choice in favor of peace.

The same applies to the consequences of the crisis in relations between the developed and the developing world. Should matters reach the point of explosion and should it become impossible to make use of the benefits derived from the exploitation of the Third World, the question of the unacceptability and intolerance of a system which cannot exist without this may appear quite pressingly on the political level. Generally speaking, from this viewpoint as well capitalism faces a hard choice: Should it take matters to the point of explosion or take into consideration the laws governing an interrelated and integral world, which demands that interests be balanced on an equal basis. Judging by the situation as we see it, this is not only necessary but also possible, the more so since forces in the Third World itself are acting in the same direction.

The decline of the national liberation movement is frequently mentioned. Clearly, however, in this case there is a substitution of terms and neglect of the novelty of the situation. If this applies to the liberation impetus, the one which operated at the stage of the struggle for political independence, naturally, it is abating. This is natural. The impetus which is needed for the new, the current stage in the development of the Third World, is only beginning to take shape. One must clearly realize this and not feel pessimistic.

The factors which make this impetus are varied and heterogeneous. This includes a powerful economic process, which sometimes assumes paradoxical aspects. For example, some countries, while remaining underdeveloped, have attained great-power status in world economics and politics. This also applies to the growth of political energy in the course of the shaping of nations and the strengthening, in the true meaning of the term, of national states, among which countries with revolutionary systems hold an important position. Also included here are the grapes of wrath based on the crying polarization between poverty and wealth and the contrast between opportunity and the real situation.

The forces of independence and autonomy are operating ever more strongly and actively in the organizations which reflect the processes of international consolidation of the developing countries. This is typical to a greater or lesser extent of all organizations, and there are many: the Organization of African Unity, the Arab League, ASEAN, the Organization of American States, the Latin American Economic System, the South Pacific Forum, the Southern Asian Regional Cooperation Association, the Islamic Conference Organization and, particularly, the nonaligned movement.

They represent a kaleidoscope of conflicting interests, needs, demands, ideologies, claims and prejudices of our specific age. All of them, although they have become

noticeable factors in world politics, have still not brought to light their possibilities. However, their potential is tremendous and it would be difficult to predict results even for the next 50 years.

What is clear is that this is an entire world which is seeking organizational forms for its efficient and equal participation in solving the problems affecting all mankind, a world of 2.5 billion people. One could anticipate that this world will not only increase with giant steps its impact on global politics but also its original role in shaping the world economy of the future.

Despite its entire power, multinational capital will be unable to define the dynamics of the Third World. Rather, it will be forced to adapt itself to the independent choice which has been or will be made by the peoples themselves. And both they and the organizations which represent them are vitally interested in a new world economic order.

Here is another important feature. Within the framework of the capitalist world itself, developments in recent decades have brought to life new forms of social contradictions and movements, such as the movement against the nuclear threat, in defense of nature, against racial discrimination, against a policy which divides society into the fortunate and the doomed, and against calamities in entire industrial areas which have become victims of new capitalist modernization. Millions of people participate in such movements. Their inspirers and leaders are noted men of science and culture and authoritative personalities on a national and international scale.

Social democratic, socialist, and labor parties and similar or related mass organizations continue to play a steady and important role in the political process of many countries, and here and there are even increasing their influence.

Therefore, along all parameters—economic, political and social—we can see the way in which in the contemporary world the concept which Lenin considered one of the most profound in Marxism is becoming comprehensively justified, namely that along with the substantiation of historical action there will be a growth in the size of the masses involved in such actions. This has always been the most accurate symptom and most powerful factor of social progress and, therefore, of peace.

Indeed, the greatness and novelty of our time resides in the fact that the peoples are present ever more clearly and openly on the proscenium of history. Today they hold positions which makes it necessary to consider them first and not in the final account. This highlights another new truth: increasingly characteristic of the dynamics of history at the turn of the century is the need for making constant choices. The accuracy of such

choices depends on the way and the extent to which the interests and thoughts of millions and hundreds of millions of people are taken into consideration.

Hence the responsibility of politicians, for politics can be realistic only if we take into consideration this new aspect of our time: today the human factor is reaching a political level which is not a distant or a more or less spontaneous result of the life and activities of human masses and their intentions. It is stubbornly entering global affairs. Failure to understand this or, in other words, failure to display a new style of thinking based on contemporary realities and the will of nations would make politics an unpredictable improvisation risky for one's own country and for other countries. Such policy cannot enjoy long-term support.

Such are the foundations for our optimistic view of the future and of the prospects for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security.

It is entirely logical for our view on problems of defense to be related to this. As long as the threat of war remains and as long as social revenge remains the pivot of Western strategy and militaristic programs, we shall continue to do everything necessary to maintain our defense power on a level which would exclude the military superiority of imperialism over socialism (*applause*).

Comrades! In these solemn days we properly note the merits of the international communist movement. The October Revolution, which has kept its international impetus to this day, is the source of its durability. The international communist movement is growing and developing on the soil of its own country. However, there is also something in common shared by the communists, whatever their nationality or country in which they work. This includes loyalty to the idea of a better, a communist society, and loyalty to the working people, above all to the working class, and the struggle for their basic interests and for peace and democracy (*applause*).

I believe that in the course of this anniversary the Third Communist International, deserves to be mentioned. We are as yet to restore the entire truth about it and write its true and complete history. Despite all the shortcomings and errors in its activities, and however bitter the memory of some of its history may be, the Comintern is part of the great past of our movement. Born of the October Revolution, it not only became a school of internationalism and revolutionary brotherhood. It made internationalism a practical weapon in the struggle for the interests of the working people and for the social progress of nations and ethnic groups. It raised cohorts of true knights of the 20th century, people of duty and honor and of high aspirations and unyielding courage, who suffered for the millions of oppressed people throughout the planet, who heard their appeal and who summoned them to the struggle (*applause*).

The communists were the first to sound the alarm about the danger of fascism. They were the first to take up the struggle against it and were its first victims. They were the first in the world to engage in an armed combat against fascism in Spain. They were the first to raise the banner of the resistance in the name of the freedom and national dignity of their peoples. It was precisely the communists, the Soviet communists above all, who made a decisive contribution to the crushing defeat of fascism in World War II (*applause*).

Both then and now, with the same irreconcilability and courage, the communists are in the front ranks against any reaction and any obscurantism. These are people of legendary heroism and dedication. They are not isolated units but in the hundreds of thousands, organized and united with a single will, iron discipline and incorruptible idea-mindedness.

The times of the Comintern, the Informburo and even of binding international conferences are in the past. However, the international communist movement exists. All parties are fully and irreversibly autonomous. We said this as early as at the 20th Congress. It is true that we did not abandon the old habits immediately. Now, however, this is an insurmountable reality. In this sense, the 27th CPSU Congress as well became a definitive and irreversible point. I believe that we proved this in fact in our relations with fraternal parties in the course of restructuring (*applause*).

The international communist movement is a turning point, as is world progress and its motive forces. The communist parties are seeking their new place in the profound changes at the end of the century. Their international movement is being renovated, promoting respect and renewed standards of trust, equality and sincere cohesion. It is open for a dialogue, for cooperation and for interaction and alliance with any other revolutionary, democratic and progressive forces.

The CPSU has no doubts as to the future of the communist movement, which is the bearer of an alternative to capitalism, and a movement of the most courageous and consistent fighters for peace, independence and progress in its own countries and for friendship among all nations on earth (*applause*).

Comrades! The most important landmark in post-October world history is the appearance of the world socialist system. For the past 4 decades socialism has become the common destiny of many nations and the most important factor in contemporary civilization.

Our party and Soviet people highly value the opportunity to interact with friends who, for several decades now have assumed, as we have, the governmental responsibility for socialism and its progress. All socialist states have acquired a great deal of interesting and useful practice in the solving of social, economic and ideological problems and in building the new life.

The socialist system and the searching and experience tested in its practical activities are of universal significance. This system has given the world its own answers to the basic problems of human life, tested its humanistic and collectivistic values, centered on the working person. The socialist system develops in man a feeling of dignity and of being the master of his country. It provides him with social protection and confidence in the future. It provides opportunities for mastering knowledge and culture and creates conditions for realizing individual capabilities and talents.

The achievements of the peoples of the socialist countries are objects of our common pride, the more so since they are also the result of long years of fruitful cooperation and of truly fraternal contacts among their citizens, unparalleled in terms of scope and openness—among party and social organizations, production collectives, creative associations and cultural institutions, families and individuals, and through the joint work and training of tens of thousands of people.

A great deal becomes clearer when looked at from the height of our accomplishments. Life has made corrections to our concepts on the laws and rates of transition to socialism and in understanding the role of socialism on a global scale. We do not believe in the least that all progressive changes which are taking place in the world are owed only to socialism. However, the way in which the questions which are of the greatest importance to mankind have been posed and the way a solution to them is being sought confirm the inseparable link between global progress and socialism as an international force (*applause*).

This connection is particularly clear in the struggle for the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and in the existence of a correlation of global forces which allows various nations to protect their sociopolitical choice more successfully.

The experience which has been acquired allows us to build better relations between socialist countries on the basis of universally acknowledged principles. They include unquestionable and total equality, the responsibility of the ruling parties for affairs in their own country and patriotic service to their own people, concern for the common cause of socialism, respect for one another and a serious attitude toward the achievements of friends and tested, voluntary and comprehensive cooperation and strict observance by all of the principles of peaceful coexistence. It is precisely on this that the practice of socialist internationalism rests.

Today the socialist world appears in front of us in its entire national and social variety. This is good and useful. We have realized that unity does not mean in the least identity and uniformity. We have also realized that there neither is nor could there be any kind of "model" of socialism against which everyone will have to compare himself.

The totality and quality of the real successes achieved in the restructuring of society in the interests of the working people are the criteria of its development at each stage and in each separate country (*applause*).

We are also aware of the harm that could result from the weakening of internationalist principles in relations among socialist countries, violations of the principle of mutual benefits and mutual aid and neglect of the common interests of socialism in activities in the world arena.

We note with satisfaction that of late our relations with all socialist countries have improved and become more dynamic. Naturally, cooperation within the Warsaw Pact and CEMA has become more fruitful and efficient. This, incidentally, does not essentially separate their members from the other socialist countries.

The 27th Congress clearly defined the position of the CPSU: In politics and in all other areas our of interaction with each socialist country, what is decisive is that which ensures the combination of mutual interests with those of socialism as a whole. The strengthening of friendship and the all-round development of cooperation with the socialist countries is the main priority in the international policy of the Soviet Union! In greeting today the delegations of the socialist countries, we greet through them the peoples of the socialist countries! (*applause*).

Dear comrades:

Respected foreign guests:

All of our thoughts and accomplishments have been and are inspired by the life-bringing force of communist ideas. These ideas were inscribed on the banners of the revolution. They led to struggle and labor accomplishments by millions of people, who sacredly trusted these ideas and adopted them as the purpose and meaning of their lives.

The work and struggle of the people and their immeasurable persistence in achieving their freely selected objectives and their joys and sufferings have all been embodied in the realities of today's socialism, which is following the path of revolutionary restructuring. This as well represents the power of the October Revolution, the power of the continuing revolution (*applause*).

For the entire 70 years, the Soviet people have been led by their tried vanguard, the Leninist Party. The party and the revolution, the party and October are indivisible (*applause*).

Without a party armed with Marxist-Leninist theory there would have been no victory of the socialist revolution. Without a party which learned how to build a new society there would have been no socialism, there would not have been our great state! Nor would there have been a base for the current renovation of all aspects of social

life and the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. Our time demands that in the new conditions as well the party be at the head of revolutionary renovation, persistently and consistently upgrading the efficiency of its policy, promoting democratization in all areas and on all levels of social life.

The increased role of the party is a legitimate process. However, this role is determined least of all by words or formal rituals. It resides in the depth and honesty of analyses and evaluations, the planning of policy and decisiveness of action, and the ability to correlate individual with common, private with social and current with long-term factors. It lies in upgrading the responsibility of all party organizations and all party members for the course of social affairs.

Our party numbers slightly under 20 million members, or 10 percent of the country's adult population. This is a tremendous force. However, the potential of the party's influence on restructuring has still not been fully deployed. The preparations for and holding of the 19th All-Union Party Conference should provide a major impetus for improving this difficult and painstaking work.

Today the fate of the great cause of the revolution, the great Leninist cause, is in our hands. Once again we are following a virgin path. This ascribes to the party, to all of us, a special responsibility. In Lenin's words, "A time of revolution is a time of action, action from the top and from the bottom" (op cit., vol 11, p 85). Such has been the tradition of the party of a new type from its very first steps. Such is the demand facing the vanguard of Soviet society at the present most difficult stage in the development of socialism which, however, is also inspirational with its novelty.

Comrades! The threshold of the true history of mankind was crossed in 1917. However, the past 70 years, the economic upheavals and social cataclysms which led to the creation of fascism and to World War II, the cold war and the arms race, the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe and global crises confirm that the past remains firmly with a significant percentage of mankind. Nonetheless, the time in which we live, the turn of the 21st century, can be justifiably considered by us as unique in terms of the depth of social changes and the global nature of the problems which are facing the peoples on earth.

We see today that mankind is indeed not doomed to exist forever as it did until October 1917. Socialism has become a powerful, growing and developing reality. It was precisely the October Revolution and precisely socialism that showed mankind the ways leading to the future, and the new values of truly human relations (*applause*): not egotism but collectivism; not exploitation

and oppression but freedom and equality; not the tyranny of the minority but true democracy; not the uncontrolled and cruel play of social forces but the growing role of reason and humaneness; not quarrels, discord and wars but universal unity and peace.

The present generations, and not only in our country alone, are responsible for the fate of civilization and of life itself on earth. In the final account, it depends on them whether or not the beginning of the new millennium in universal history will become its tragic epilogue or an inspiring prologue to the future.

No more than slightly more than 13 years remain until the start of the 21st century. And in the year 2017 our people and all progressive mankind will celebrate the centennial of the Great October Revolution.

What kind of world will it be at the point when we will cross the century mark of our revolution? What kind of socialism will it be, what level of maturity will have been reached by the world community of states and nations? We shall not engage in guessing. We must remember, however, that it is precisely today that we are laying the foundations for the future. It is our duty to preserve our unique civilization and life itself on earth, to achieve the triumph of reason over nuclear insanity and to create all the necessary conditions for the free and comprehensive development of man and mankind (*sustained applause*).

We see the opportunity for endless progress. We realize that ensuring it will be difficult. This does not frighten us. On the contrary, it inspires us, for it gives life a deeply humane objective and profound meaning!

In October 1917 we left the old world behind, having rejected it irrevocably. We are marching to a new world, the world of communism, and we shall never deviate from that path! (*tempestuous and sustained applause*).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

Leningrad In October

18020005b Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 41-53

[Article by V. Kadulin and S. Kolesnikov]

[Text] Places remembered by the people have an amazing property: they seem to exist simultaneously in two dimensions: today and during those bygone years. Such is the nature of the city on the Neva, with all of its boulevards and squares and unique monuments. No less exciting, however, is an itinerary which does not take us to a museum: starting with going down a narrow staircase from the fourth floor of a residential home on Serdobolskaya, then taking the streetcar along Karl Marks Prospect, formerly Sampsoniyevskiy, and then on

walking across the Liteynyy Bridge and down the present Voinov Street, which leads straight to Smolnyy. This was the route which V.I. Lenin took in October 1917. Those days Smolnyy became the generator of energy for the renovation of the country's life.

Today Smolnyy is a historical address, but also an entirely practical, a modern one. It is the seat of the party headquarters for Leningrad's restructuring. Here positive and constructive processes in the city and its oblast are gathering strength. Our story is about are encountered in the activities of the oblast party organization and the problems which appear in the course of this major and complex project.

Dynamics of Priorities

The list of ships under construction at the Baltiyskiy Shipyards imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze begins with the nuclear-powered ships "Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya" and "Sovetskiy Soyuz," both of tremendous size and power. The similarity between these two names is symbolic, for it is precisely the October Revolution that made our country one of the great world powers.

As we know, the keel of the nuclear-powered ship "Sovetskiy Soyuz" was laid under the name of "Leonid Brezhnev." The collective of the Baltiyskiy insisted that it be renamed, sensibly considering impossible to give to a ship embodying the headlong nature of contemporary scientific and technical progress the name of a person with whom stagnation and negative phenomena in the life of our society are strongly related. This is a lesson to us all. It is a lesson in political culture, which reminds us yet once again of Lenin's modesty, which called for relying on the assessments of time which, as we know, is the best and fairest of judges.

Here is another detail in the production life of these two ships under construction at the shipyards, which expresses, we believe, the features of our times: when the plant's leadership and the public organizations called yet once again upon the people to tighten up labor discipline and increase labor productivity under the conditions of restructuring, the answer they heard, as was publicly confirmed by plant director Hero of Socialist Labor V.N. Shershnev, was rather unusual: Was the pace of construction of such ships, so greatly needed by the national economy, not too slow, in terms of current planning? This was said during particularly difficult transitional conditions for our economy, when by virtue of a variety of internal and external hindrances the implementation of production schedules presents great difficulties to the Baltiyskiy shipbuilders.

The people, as M.S. Gorbachev noted during his trip to Leningrad, are beginning to straighten up their shoulders and to feel themselves masters of the city, oblast and country.

In the first 10 months of this year the growth rates in the volume of industrial output in the city and oblast were 103 percent. Labor productivity increased by 4.1 percent. We believe it is also worth noting that Leningrad's industry fulfilled ahead of schedule its assignment for the first 2 years of the 5-year plan for growth rates of labor productivity on the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. In short, the post-April acceleration made substantial changes in the course of implementation of the program for the intensification of Leningrad's economy. Some of its important landmarks planned for the year 1990 have already been reached.

According to B.V. Ulyanov, head of the party obkom economic department, the city's industry is functioning today with fewer workers and manpower has been reallocated as necessary. Under the circumstances of Leningrad this is of essential significance. The demographic legacy of the war continues substantially to complicate the problem of manpower resources. A significant percentage of the urban population consists of people past working age. In the mid-1970s Leningrad accepted from other parts of the country as many as 50,000 people annually. Of late it has been able to reduce the amount of manpower drawn from the outside to 15,000-20,000. However, this too is a heavy burden for the urban economy, for settling each new worker costs the city 15,000 rubles.

Considering this situation, some quality aspects in the work of Leningrad's industry seem encouraging. In 1986 more than 5,000 people were actually released and another 11,000 were released in the first 10 months of this year. This is merely the beginning of the extensive efforts to rationalize industry. Soon sectorial science will begin to convert to full cost accounting on a vast scale, which will force it to aspire to victory through skill rather than numbers. Incidentally, it is skill that made it possible, with an increased volume of industrial output averaging 6.7 percent in 1985 and 1986, to reduce metal intensiveness of commodity output by 15 percent and power consumption by 4.5 percent.

These figures are the result of the controlled process within the "Intensification-90" program of putting to practical use the achievements of science and technology, and the stable trend of broadening the scale of renovation of capital assets. Many Leningrad enterprises actively undertook to master the latest resource-saving technologies. With increasing firmness Leningraders are now removing from their enterprises surplus or inefficient equipment and are optimizing the structure of their machinery.

At the Baltiyskiy Plant as well, starting with this year, more than 70 percent of the equipment planned for removal has been already dismantled or replaced with new equipment. However, preparations for a conversion to two- and three-shift work was not limited to this. Material incentive was used for people who agreed to work in shifts. The night shift receives food and its

transportation has been organized. The plant was also concerned with training an additional contingent of machine-tool operators at the base PTU and directly at the plant. In the final account, all of this enabled it to raise the shift coefficient of high-efficiency equipment to 1.7 and, which is quite important, to stabilize capital returns.

Naturally, it would be naive to assume that in this October of 1987 Leningrad is showing headlong progress in its industry, with no hitches. Unquestionably, the Leningraders drew lessons from the criticism addressed to them 2.5 years ago during the first visit which M.S. Gorbachev paid to the city as CPSU Central Committee general secretary. Suffice it to recall the tangible successes they have achieved in the development of light industry. However, considering the city's status as one of the acknowledged leaders in restructuring, makes it incumbent upon the Leningrad party organization to develop a particularly sober and self-critical attitude toward its own unfinished projects, which are quite tangible in terms of consequences, perhaps for the fact alone that Leningrad's industrial output accounts for 3 percent of the overall volume of the country's industrial production. However, the Leningrad machine building industry fulfilled its contractual obligations for the first 10 months of the year 97.5 percent only. More than one-half of associations and enterprises within the machine building complex found themselves owing more production. In turn, many Leningrad enterprises are suffering from the lack of discipline shown by their suppliers.

In the view of the party obkom, the problems of ensuring the faster development of the machine building complex are being solved with major difficulties. As in the past, inertia in the activities of central departments, sectorial ministries and even enterprises and associations themselves, remains inordinately strong. This is manifested, in particular, in the fact that a significant percentage of capital investments in the technical retooling of operating enterprises has been postponed by the sectorial leaderships for the end of the 5-year period. In 1986 the coefficient of renovating the active part of capital assets of nine machine building ministries was nearly one-half that of the planned average annual level for this 5-year period. A number of enterprises within the complex are not fulfilling their assignments on mastering and producing most important types of new machines and equipment.

Currently the formulation of the "Intensification-95" program is in full swing in Leningrad, and its concept is being refined. The main emphasis is on the development of large item-oriented and comprehensively automated sections, shops and production lines planned in accordance with territorial-sectorial specialization and cooperation. The center of gravity of the entire work related to the formulation of the program is moved straight to the labor collectives.

Departmental barriers obstructing the broad-scale intensification of the regional economy and causing the exceptional weakness of horizontal, of intersectorial relations among enterprises and organizations and the extremely low level of production cooperation are becoming increasingly intolerable. That is why the Leningrad economic managers were so greatly pleased with the party's support of their suggestion about setting up powerful state intersectorial production associations, the extensive possibilities of which would inevitably make it necessary to take a new look at the prospect of centralized management of public production.

B.I. Fomin, general director of Elektrosila and one of the initiators of the creation of contemporary socialist corporations, described the complex fate of this idea which was submitted by the managers of Leningrad enterprises to the party obkom, where it met with total understanding and support. For the sake of fairness we must point out that the same understanding, not to mention support, on the part of sectorial ministries was not given to the directors or the party obkom. What helped was the intervention of the Central Committee. Yes, we are increasingly mastering economic management methods and decisively abandoning the command-administrative style. This does not mean, however, that the party committees must stand aside of economic management. Furthermore, at the present particularly difficult stage in restructuring, it is precisely the party authorities that are the bearers of the political will and the ideas of renovation, which play a key role in this process.

Worker Pride

At the very turn of the century, Lenin's ISKRA wrote: "Nowhere else in Russia is there such a concentration of factory-plant workers as in Petersburg; nowhere else are the typical features of a proletarian environment (feeling of solidarity, feeling of personal dignity and desire for knowledge and freedom) manifested so clearly as among the masses of Petersburg workers." Such an environment, with its distinguished features, has long existed at the Baltiyskiy Plant as well, which is one of the oldest enterprises in the country. Its labor biography is over 130-years old. The best political, practical and moral qualities of the Peter working class, noted in ISKRA, are greatly needed today.

Their bearers are the plant's veterans, such as fitter-assemblyman Nikolay Stepanovich Sorokin, who proudly describes himself as an old Peterburger. With rare unanimity the thousand-strong collective considers him a gentle, warm and responsive person and a master of the highest degree. Nikolay Stepanovich was born in 1905. It was in 1907 that the large machine shop of the Baltiyskiy Plant was built, where Sorokin has worked steadily for more than 60 years, including the entire 900 days of the Leningrad blockade. Also working here are his eldest son Yuriy, his youngest Georgiy and his grandson Vadim. The more than 160 years dedicated to the plant by the Sorokin worker dynasty are also a period

of shaping the fruitful layer of worker standards and the raising of workers-intellectuals who, at the turn of the century, were the pioneers in the three Russian revolutions and are today leaders in restructuring.

There is nothing in N.S. Sorokin to remind us of a "showcase general." This man, who is past 80, is working in the most difficult, the most precise and fine finishing operations, respected by his comrades for the magic of his restless worker hands and his strictly honest and stern attitude toward assignments and troublesome obligations as chairman of the council of tutors in the rayon and the title of member of the Communist Party, within whose ranks he has spent more than 6 decades.

At our meeting in Smolnyy this old Balt spoke emotionally and frankly about the upbringing of young people and passing on to them the revolutionary staff of the October Revolution. Nikolay Stepanovich is right: Regardless of changing conditions, the concepts of bad and good work remain unchanged. Today, like yesterday, and like 70 years ago, naturally, the working man is proud of his accomplishments and dreams to see in his children those who will continue what he has started. Worker pride is a very important and necessary instrument in this daily painstaking work of restructuring.

The shipyard's labor collective, which was established a long time ago and which has acquired firm labor and revolutionary traditions, plays a particular role in restructuring. These traditions form a thick layer of culture without which the truly accelerated progress of developing socialism would be simply impossible. Such a standard of thoughts and feelings, words and actions, standards of working and living and human contacts are all necessary components of restructuring, its starting premise and its most important objective. Such standards cannot be established surreptitiously, in a single day, under the influence of all social factors, including large-scale machine output.

Currently the Baltiyskiy collective is concerned with how to be better and more thoroughly prepared for the enactment of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association), how to organize more accurately the cost accounting mechanism and a most important unit within it, such as brigade contracting, and how to choose and apply the most viable forms of worker self-government.

Naturally, restructuring the economic mechanism is not something that can be accomplished within a single day. That is why it is so important today for the frontranking workers in the individual collectives, arming themselves with patience and fighting depression caused by possible failures and errors, to be ready for stubborn, patient and largely unfamiliar practical work. In the past, they have been frequently misled by impatience and the aspiration to get rid of difficulties which had taken years to accumulate, in one fell swoop.

N.S. Sorokin, head of the first youth shock brigade in the history of the plant, realized through personal experience the creative possibilities of skillfully organized socialist competition. He has the full support of V.N. Shershnev, the plant's director, and A.S. Klyuchnikov, the party committee secretary. The plant is making changes in the system of awards presented to competition winners and is harnessing other opportunities related to the conversion of the enterprise to new economic management methods.

Under the conditions of restructuring, legitimately priority in the activities of the plant's party committee and administration is given to a cadre policy consistent with its objectives. Today efforts are being made to combine within the cadre work at the Baltiyskiy Plant three important areas of the overall strategy of change: universal technical and economic training, cadre certification and preparations for the introduction of new wage and salary rates.

Over the past 2 years about 20 percent of managers have been replaced in the collective. Young and capable specialists have been appointed to many key command positions, frequently through elections. Thus, for example, the managements of the boiler, timber processing and consumer goods production shops have been replaced entirely. Naturally, changes for the better did not occur everywhere and immediately. Here and there, however, the changes which took place were striking. For example, this year the production of consumer goods at the plant will be nearly 30 percent higher.

The plant's director is convinced that the essential purpose, the objective of the new wage and salary rates is not simply to increase the wages of one specialist or another, but to achieve a more accurate evaluation of his work and to streamline material incentive. The procedures should be simple: more money will be paid to those who work better. The cost of faults in the shop's production plan or errors in technical documentation is high: tension among performers, expensive redoing of the job and loss of production rhythm. That is why the introduction of the new wage and salary rates was initiated at the plant in the engineering, technological and design services.

Increasingly, restructuring is giving a human dimension to the most important criteria in assessing party and economic activities and management standards. Under contemporary conditions even the traditional production competition among enterprises, the leadership of the Baltiyskiy plant has noted, is increasingly shifting to the solution of social problems. V.N. Shershnev believes that managers who, as in the past, continue to believe that a shop could do without locker rooms and saunas, that an auxiliary farm is merely a burden to the enterprise or that it is the soviets that must be concerned with providing housing to the plant personnel, if not today then tomorrow or absolutely the day after tomorrow, is bankrupt.

We saw at the plant's party committee a plan for housing construction until the year 2000. According to this program its pace was based on the annual completion of 300 housing units for the plant personnel. No blame attaches for dependency by the drafters of this program, for a substantial share of the solution of the housing problem is that of the plant personnel themselves, construction with the forces of the plant itself, and a certain reliance on the creation of a youth residential complex.

Our interlocutors did not conceal that they were relying on the approval of their program by the general secretary, a program which, after a long period of time during which the collective had been put on short rations, would mean drastic progress in solving the housing problem. M.S. Gorbachev admonished the plant's management for drafting an insufficiently daring program which would drag until the year 2000 and called upon them to rely even more firmly on their own strength and to involve the plant personnel in the construction process more extensively and more energetically. As we were told at the party committee, the workers are extremely eager to undertake the building of such housing. However, wishes alone are insufficient. What are needed are construction materials, which are still in extremely short supply. For that reason, together with the ministry and the city organizations, the plant's leadership assessed all possible choices and undertook the formulation of a realistic plan for accelerated housing construction and for ensuring proper material support for the program.

Restructuring has entered the critical area of the practical implementation of its stipulations and concepts, converted into visible and substantial accomplishments. Here the party members must be the first to speak out and to take the first step. The plant's primary party organization has 2,812 members. It would be no exaggeration to say that this is a tremendous force. According to A.S. Klyuchnikov, one should also be concerned with upgrading the role of secretaries of shop party organizations and party group organizers and of the entire elected party aktiv and with creating all the necessary organizational and material conditions for the full implementation of the obligations assigned to this aktiv.

Mastering the Standards of Democracy

It was the intention of Lenmetrostroy to build the lobby of a new subway station at the corner of Ligovskiy Prospekt. This was necessary. However, this also meant wrecking houses which did not seem to be particularly valuable but which were typical of the old 19th-century Petersburg buildings. Reacting to a letter by a group of Leningraders, the city executive committee decided to halt the wrecking of such housing until a specific decision could be made. Sharp debates went on for 4 hours at the GlavAPU of the Leningrad Soviet Executive Committee. The arguments of the public were heard out. This time specialists and construction workers were able to prove the need for such wrecking (incidentally, the opposite is a frequent phenomenon, as numerous reports

in the Leningrad press have indicated). However, this meeting proved something else as well: the need for glasnost and extensive discussion of any project which touches upon the city's architecture, which has developed over the centuries. Such discussions should take place not after the bulldozers have already started their work but much earlier. This is so that the notorious case of the building in which Sergey Yesenin lived would not be repeated and so that the authorities and public activists would realize firmly that without a dialogue, a calm comparison of views and the selection of the best choice no such problem can be solved today.

"We must jointly master the standards of democracy," said M.S. Gorbachev at his meeting with the people of Leningrad. "All of our cadres, whatever their rank, must learn how to take into consideration the feelings of the masses which, incidentally, they should also be able to influence skillfully."

The Leningrad party organization was among the first to initiate a movement for a regular dialogue with the people and for mastering the standards of democracy. An example of this is found in the regular sociological surveys which are conducted, as assigned by the obkom, 3 to 4 times annually, by the academic Institute for Socioeconomic Problems. The questions affect the main problems: the attitude toward restructuring, defining one's place in the renovation process and democratization. The results of such surveys are not lacquered and neither are they glossed over. Yes, no less than 99 percent of Leningraders are in favor of the changes under way. Many of them, however, conceive of restructuring in abstract terms, as not applicable to themselves, their collective or their specific work sector. Only about one-third of those surveyed had become aware of actual results of restructuring.

In describing the results obtained by the sociologists, A.Ya. Degtyarev, Leningrad Obkom secretary, noted a significant phenomenon in present social awareness, that of impatience. Now, when restructuring has entered its most crucial period, this noble feeling could play a twin role: urge people to act and engage in specific activities for the common good or else trigger fits of irritation and apathy. Obviously, there is still a clear lack of ability in some ideological workers to master the situation and, in many cases, as in the matter of retail prices, they simply lack reliable information and convincing arguments. What is clear is that we must look for more efficient ways and means of work which would influence the people's beliefs, based on extensively informing the working people and working actively for winning public opinion over.

The Leningrad mass information media have begun to play a more efficient role in this area. The city and oblast newspapers have become more popular; Leningrad's television programs have an audience of 12 million people. Therefore, extensive opportunities exist in this

area. The journalists are working precisely in that direction. A cycle of television programs entitled "Public Opinion" was aired. Debates and a variety of views on most topical problems were presented on the screen, such as the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism, assessments on the course of restructuring in Leningrad (the program was produced soon after the June Central Committee Plenum), and the activities of cooperatives. On each occasion, in the course of the 3-hour program, every viewer is given the opportunity to express his opinion on any one of the suggestions formulated on the screen. Mobile television stations were set up at the busiest crossroads. In the studio, a group of sociological experts analyzed with a computer the input of information. It may be that from the viewpoint of "big" science, this is not sufficiently representative, and that the "voice from the crowd" does not always reflect the opinion of the majority. However, the lesson in polemics, equality of opinion and democracy is clear.

The predominant form of television and radio broadcasting today is that of debates, involving the maximally largest number of people. The purpose of restructuring in radio and television is to provide the fullest possible information to Leningraders of means of restructuring, the formulation of new approaches to complex problems of the city's life and the active involvement of collective thinking in the solution of topical problems. The virtually entire leadership of the Leningrad City Executive Committee and its main administrations answered in front of the entire city questions telephoned in by television and radio listeners and viewers.

We were told by the Leningrad television and radio committee that the problem of the "image" of the manager, which is entirely new in terms of our practical experience, has now appeared. Today one must have the ability to address an audience, and an official cannot isolate himself from the people behind his office walls. The city managers have lost their previous "anonymity" and depersonalization. It is as though the screen highlights "who is who." Whereas in the past, as a rule, a number of agreements had to be reached before one manager or another could be talked into speaking live on television, a special resolution passed by the obkom secretariat solved the problem. In discussing any given item at the meeting of the city soviets and at gorkom conferences one could hear the question: "Have you talked to the people, have you been on television?"

The October days in Leningrad were bright and sunny. The air over the city showed an autumn cleanliness, undisturbed by industrial smoke. The transparency and cleanliness of the air over Leningrad, which is cleaner than that in many other cities in the country, have been secured, so to say, ecologically.

In the past 2 years draining polluted water in Leningrad's water reservoirs has been reduced by nearly one-quarter billion cubic meters. This was accomplished through dedicated efforts and an intensive struggle waged by

numerous and selfless enthusiasts concerned with environmental protection. The lessons and events accompanying this work were described to us by Orest Aleksandrovich Skarlato, director of the Zoological Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who heads the Scientific Council on Environmental Protection Problems of the USSR Academy of Sciences Interdepartmental Coordination Council. Another feature of the time is the truly daring and energetic steps which were taken recently to save Lake Ladoga. The Leningrad party obkom assumed a firm stance in the protection of nature, decisively supporting the concern shown by the scientists. This made defeating the opposition of supporters of a narrow-departmental approach possible.

"We owe our initial victories in the struggle for the ecological safety of the area," O.A. Skarlato said, "to the policy of glasnost, which brought to life restructuring and the development of democracy. Actually, as long as scientists were discussing problems among themselves and asked in their letters the help of departmental managers, matters moved extremely slowly or not at all. It was their appeal to the broad public in the press that made a change.

The self-awareness, political responsibility and social activeness of the people increase in the course of democratization and broadening of glasnost, criticism and self-criticism. This is confirmed by the recent elections for local soviets of people's deputies. There were heated discussions of candidacies. For example, the collective of the Leningrad Electrical Engineering Institute discussed 250 candidates before two representatives of the VUZ were nominated for elections to rayon soviet deputies. There were 10 candidates for one deputy mandate at Lenmetrostroy. Here is a characteristic feature: a number of party organizations were unable to obtain support for the candidates they had recommended, 67 of the them in the city and the oblast. What was this: An alarming symptom of "anarchy" or a breath of true democracy? We choose the latter. However, we cannot fail to be concerned by frequently encountered inability and unwillingness of some cadres to work in a new style, and their habit to "let things run themselves." Reality has already proved that such an attitude should not exist in ideology and politics. We were told at the obkom about one such "semi-mystery-novel" story. In Tosnenskiy Rayon, in the oblast, where an experiment on multiple-mandate elections was being conducted, on the eve of the vote a group of "agitators" knocked on doors, appealing to the people not to vote for a given candidate, which is what happened. It later turned out that these were "informal" agitators who had come from Leningrad. The question is, where were the real agitators? They, however, acted formally. Yet today's ideological and sociopolitical life tolerates no formalism.

Incidentally, as to the so-called informal groups: many of them may be found throughout the country today. In Leningrad there are some 2,000 such groups, rallying

more than 100,000 people, mainly young. This is a great force which is largely ignored by the party committees. However, here as well Leningraders have taken important steps to come closer to such associations and to engage them in a dialogue. This applies to young people who try to find their place in life, to help their native town and to preserve and increase their native culture.

A significant number of informal associations are concerned with problems of preserving monuments. As we pointed out, gradually contacts in this area are starting to be organized. The attention which the public pays to the urban construction situation is so close and sharp that architects and construction workers are forced to revise their usual relations with the citizens. Anyone who cares for the fate of Leningrad was pleased to learn of the city executive committee's decision concerning houses related to the life of F.M. Dostoyevskiy. We must point out that it was the publish that drew the attention of the city managers to the fate of such houses. Therefore, it is entirely feasible to blend the efforts of those who are sincerely interested in preserving the historical memory of the people.

An attentive attitude toward the various trends which appear on the grounds of artistic standards yields good results. For quite some time Leningrad has had no problem with concerts given by youth music ensembles or exhibits by young painters. The party committees proved to be more far-sighted than some managers of creative associations who, for a long time, kept talented young people at a distance. Another question, which frequently confounds some ideological workers is what to do with punkers, rockers and metallists? Should they "fight" them, applying the methods of the 1950s, with the help of public order units? Something else was done in Leningrad. For example, quite recently, members of a variety of informal groups, including some which are usually referred to exclusively in pejorative terms, attended a subbotnik on the reconstruction of the Museum of the Great October Socialist Revolution, "voluntarily and free of charge," to quote from a home-made poster which was tacked to the grill of the old Kshesinskiya home. The recognition of the initiatives of the youngsters and their right to engage in something useful was their reward and, perhaps, may have led them to consider their own future more seriously.

Naturally, we have no intention of idealizing the situation. The activities of informal associations have other, less pleasing, aspects. Merely the first steps have been taken in working and establishing contacts with them (incidentally, they were taken precisely by the party authorities and not the Komsomol which should be the first to be concerned with the life and future of the young). The moment a given phenomenon becomes socially significant, it is precisely then that political workers and ideologues must apply their efforts. We must study and mold the interests, needs and opinions of young people. This must be done without banning, labeling or applying administrative pressure. Today this is the only way.

A democratic standard involves a number of factors, which includes those we mentioned. As M.S. Gorbachev noted during his talk with Leningraders, the people must feel that they are socialists in a socialist country. They must live in an atmosphere of respect for the person.

At the Head of Restructuring

Leningrad, its working class, the working people and the Leningrad party organization play a noteworthy role in the life of the country and in the implementation of the changes earmarked by the party. We asked Yu.F. Solov'yev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom, to describe the primary tasks which face today the party members in the city and oblast.

[Question] What changes have taken place in the activities of the Leningrad party organization in the past 2 years? What are the most important problems which it is solving today? What is hindering restructuring?

[Answer] The first and most important thing is the new attitude of the people toward the work and the tasks which were defined at the crucial April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and which constitute the essence of restructuring and the party's course, as codified at its 27th Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums.

The very mood of the people is changing. Their actions are marked by greater practicality, daring and creative approaches, initiatives and interest in the beneficial changes which are taking place in all areas of our life. Ostentation and hullabaloo, excessive organization and complacency are becoming features of the past. Briefly, the human factor is becoming increasingly active in influencing the solution of pressing socioeconomic and sociopolitical problems. Hence the tangible results obtained in accelerating the area's socioeconomic development.

State plans are being implemented as a whole steadily. The discipline of contractual procurements has improved somewhat and, compared with 1985, the growth rates of industrial output and construction have increased; the quality of output has improved and industry is being converted to two- and three-shift work. Positive changes are taking place in the social infrastructure and in the working, living and recreational conditions of the people.

All of this is based on the persistent work done by the party committees and organizations in the implementation of the party's course of democratization and glasnost, the open formulation of questions on ways to surmount existing difficulties, a collectivistic approach and taking extensively into consideration the views of party members and working people in decision-making.

The members of party committees directly participate in informing the party members of adopted resolutions. They specifically supervise their implementation and analyze and submit for consideration by CPSU gorkom and raykom buros problems of the work of the party apparatus and its departments, and provide on-site practical aid.

Another characteristic feature of the changes taking place is the fact that the party apparatus is allocating increasing amounts of time for work within the primary party organizations. This does not apply to the party apparatus exclusively. Party obkom, gorkom and raykom secretaries and buro members deem it their prime duty to consult with the party members, to check collective views in approaching one serious problem and decision or another. The people welcome and support such changes and actively respond to practical suggestions or formulate them themselves.

Let me cite an example. It cannot be said that in the past we paid little attention to a large category of the aktiv, such as the party group organizers. We sponsored rallies and conferences in the individual sectors, and various seminars. All of this, however, was, to begin with, done infrequently and, secondly, such mass projects were frequently formal, for which reason they yielded no effective returns. The approach now has changed. In this area the oblast committee supported the initiative of the Leningrad Gorkom on holding regular monthly party group organizer days. Thus, recently the question of party assignments was discussed at a party group organizer day. For it is no secret that most party members—30-40 percent—have been given assignments on an occasional basis. Today we are persistently demanding that every member of the oblast party organization be given a party assignment, specific, essential and with a deadline.

The working people, the communists, have become the real support of the party authorities in the implementation of cadre policy which has been subjected to substantial changes. The open promotion of leading party and soviet personnel and the election of captains of industry on all levels, from brigade leaders to enterprise and establishment directors, with alternate candidacies, and competition for specific positions, have become the rule.

This year alone about 14,000 managers of party, soviet and Komsomol organizations and production managers have been elected in Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast. More than 4,500 candidacies were discussed, which proves the increased self-awareness and political and civic activeness of the people.

Party members are being assigned to the party agencies only with the recommendation of labor collectives where they work and the opinion of the collective is decisive. This strengthens the party apparatus morally and politically.

Work with the promotion reserve is being changed radically. Today the reports submitted by party committees and bureaus on guiding restructuring in the primary party organizations deal with practical and political qualities of all party members who are included in the party cadre reserve, including the first secretaries of CPSU gorkoms and raykoms. This yields substantial results. To begin with, this means open consultation with the people. Second, a more objective assessment is provided of cadres. Their practical, political and moral qualities are brought to light, which enables us to include in the reserve truly tested people, soundly thinking and initiative-minded. They are also given the necessary training. The same approach, on our recommendation, is being adopted by the soviets, the trade unions and the Komsomol.

The search in the various areas is constant and intensive. We consider it particularly significant in connection with the implementation of the exceptionally responsible assignments which were set by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev during his stay in Leningrad, on the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

The CPSU Obkom is steadily analyzing and summing up the experience acquired on the most important problems of party building; a persistent search is conducted for answers to the most relevant problems: How should party members act under the conditions of restructuring in order not to fall behind dynamically developing social processes?

Practicality in restructuring is an essential requirement toward which we direct the party committees in order to prevent them from dashing around but do their work in a new fashion, thoughtfully, consistently and persistently.

In making an objective assessment of accomplishments and without exaggerating the significance of results, we should point out that many problems remain in promoting profound changes, along with factors which hinder the acceleration process.

The necessary acceleration has not been reached as yet on all levels of the work of the Leningrad party organization. This was clearly indicated by a recent study conducted by the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat on the work of Vyborgskiy Party Raykom in Leningrad. The main feature which was noted was that the raykom has not as yet become the true political center of restructuring in the rayon and has been unable to ensure the increased combativeness of each primary party organization.

What hinders restructuring?

This is a comprehensive and complex problem. We say that one of the important prerequisites for the success of restructuring is the human factor. A great deal is already being done to enhance it. However, we should also

mention the fact that in some cases we also face obstructions. They come from the people themselves, from their mentality and existing mental stereotypes. For example, on the one hand, this is manifested in the efforts of some economic managers, engineering and technical personnel and even workers to preserve obsolete administrative-bureaucratic management methods and wage equalization or, in short, all that which, in the past, ensured their peaceful life. This is simple and easier and, above all, does not require any concern or thought on how to improve matters. Some production leaders, who until recently complained of the lack of sufficient rights and necessary autonomy, having obtained both, are in no hurry whatsoever to apply them but, as in the past, await instructions "from above." Furthermore, for the time being the real interests of the people and of labor collectives are still being sluggishly included in the economic management system. On the other hand, party authorities and individual party workers still frequently interfere in the activities of economic managers, thus depriving them of autonomy and initiative.

Bureaucratic barriers remain a major obstruction. Some problems could be solved quickly and efficiently. However, the party workers write papers, coordinate them endlessly, decisions are dragged out, unnecessary encrustations develop and matters do not advance. Above all, this lowers the responsibility of the people for their assignments.

To an even greater extent bureaucratism is inherent in our soviet machinery. The way to its decisive elimination is only one: democratic methods of work with cadres and mandatory consideration of the opinion of labor collectives in appointing soviet personnel. This helps to strengthen its apparatus with competent, honest and principle-minded people and good organizers.

As we can see, it is important to direct the human factor to the solution of the problems of restructuring and, therefore, the elimination of obstructing factors.

[Question] The question of reinterpreting the ways and means of party leadership of the economy was sharply raised at the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. What do you consider as the essence of the new approaches in this most important area? What specific changes have taken place in the work of the party committees on different levels?

[Answer] The course of restructuring and the ways of accelerating its pace in the area, based on the conclusions of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum, were thoroughly considered at the party obkom plenum. The main conclusion which was reached was that under the conditions of a conversion from administrative-arbitrary management to economic methods and the expanded rights and autonomy of enterprises, objectively the role and responsibility of party organizations, party committees and bureaus on all levels for the state of affairs in labor collectives objectively become greater.

This premise is inseparable from the course toward the intensification of democratic principles in all areas of social life. Its essence is changing the ways and means of party leadership, and is upgrading the significance of party committees as agencies of collective political management.

This means constantly relying on the elected aktiv, on people, rejecting dispatching functions or taking over from soviet and economic authorities, and the mastery and comprehensive assertion of the new economic thinking, based on concern for end national economic results, reducing the "gross output" of paper in the work in favor of direct contacts with people.

The most important task now is to complete preparations for the enactment of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association). In this area success can be ensured only if not only economic managers and individual services but also all labor collectives and party organizations become involved.

The experience of converting a number of Leningrad enterprises (72 of them currently) to full cost accounting and self-financing indicates that this is by no means a simple matter. However, wherever its nature and features have been studied extensively and economic and organizational problems have been solved in advance and wherever party committees and buros have acted in a new style positive results have been achieved.

The CPSU Obkom links restructuring of the regional economy to a strict demarcation among the functions of party, soviet and economic authorities. The CPSU gorkoms and raykoms have given up considering letters and telegrams they receive on problems of economic activities. The number of conferences on current production problems has diminished sharply.

In formulating specific assignments, the party authorities concentrate on ensuring their implementation and organizing efficient on-site control. They try to be active promoters of restructuring processes and comprehensive encourage their intensification and development.

Such practices enable the soviet and economic authorities to act with greater independence and efficiency and make fuller use of their rights.

We also relate to the increased activeness and initiatives of the party organizations the implementation of the suggestions approved by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on accelerating the reconstruction and technical retooling of enterprises, writing off a significant percentage of obsolete equipment and ensuring the more efficient use of advanced facilities, thus freeing additional production areas. This 5-year period extensive work must be done in this area.

The "Intensification-95" program is being drafted in accordance with developing the existing territorial-sectorial program for the intensification of Leningrad's economy.

[Question] How are the traditions of socialist democracy of the October Revolution developing in Leningrad city life?

[Answer] We consider as one of the most important traditions the high activeness of the party members, the reliance of party organizations on the working class and the consideration of its views, suggestions and remarks.

Let us recall that plans for comprehensive economic and social development appeared precisely thanks to the extensive consultations by party committees and economic managers with the working people. Understandably, in the course of such contacts questions related to the solution of production and social problems and the satisfaction of the needs of the people arose. Such an extensive discussion of plans and their shortcomings was the initial stage in the comprehensive planning of economic and social development.

Many good initiatives were created precisely in this manner. This precisely is the profound meaning of democracy, a situation in which the views and suggestions of the people are taken actively into consideration and become important features in the foundations and style of management.

Glasnost, democratization and enhancement of all other social structures and institutions create a qualitatively new situation in party organizations and labor collectives. This assigns particular responsibility to party members and party organizations for familiarity with the situation and the people and with the moral and psychological climate.

The dynamically advancing processes of restructuring and the development of self-government objectively promote the social activeness of all population strata. It is important to consolidate and develop positive trends. In particular, the public and the young will be included ever more extensively in solving problems which have accumulated in the development of the social infrastructure, involving them in the construction of housing and other projects and in the restoration of architectural monuments.

A great deal is being accomplished currently for the party committees and soviet agencies to master problems related to amateur associations, to display greater activeness and daring in their work with them and to show tactfulness and ability to convince and use discussions more extensively as instruments for political and moral influence. It is a question of developing in the young generation a self-awareness based on concern for the

common good, an active life stance and profound democratic standards, and of promoting loyalty to communist ideals and the moral values of socialism.

Glasnost has introduced a noticeable revival in the activities of the creative associations of the artistic intelligentsia. The lifting of bans on many topics and subjects, and giving back to readers, viewers and listeners works, the dynamics of which had been interrupted precisely because of subjectivism, taste prejudices and individual assessments, are major features of our time. Good changes are being manifested also in the new principles of work done by the creative organizations and in appointing to managerial positions fresh young forces.

The dynamics of the development of the democratic traditions of the Great October Revolution can be clearly traced in major and minor accomplishments. The task is formulated as follows: every person must be firmly convinced that any useful initiative and practical undertaking will meet with the party's response and active support.

As in the rest of the country, restructuring in our area is intensifying and growing, ascribing to social progress a powerful acceleration impetus. It opens the way to the fuller involvement of the working people in production management and motivates every party committee and individual party member to assess achievements with a high degree of responsibility and implement with twice the amount of energy the revolutionary changes earmarked by the party.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

Acceleration and Science in Siberia

18020005c Moscow *KOMMUNIST in Russian* No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 54-66

[KOMMUNIST, CPSU Novosibirsk Obkom and USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department Presidium roundtable]

[Text] The USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department is 30 years old. The powerful scientific potential which has been acquired within that time is an important instrument in the transformation of Siberian production forces. More than 60 scientific research and experimental design institutions of the department are concentrated in six comprehensive scientific centers in Novosibirsk, Irkutsk, Krasnoyarsk, Tomsk, Ulan-Ude and Yakutsk. Its institutions and departments are located in large cities such as Barnaul, Kemerovo, Kyzyl, Omsk, Tyumen and Chita. Its 10,000 scientific associates include 80 USSR Academy of Sciences academicians and corresponding members, more than 700 doctors and about 5,000 candidates of sciences.

The results of 30 years of development of the department, the way for the most efficient utilization of the results of scientific research in the national economy and the tasks and future of restructuring of academic science with a view to the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the problems related to them were discussed at the House of Scientists of Akademgorodok in Novosibirsk, at a roundtable meeting which, as has already been reported, was sponsored by KOMMUNIST jointly with the Novosibirsk CPSU Obkom and the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department Presidium. It included the participation of leading scientists from the USSR AN SO, representatives of the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, VASKHNIL, the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Institute of Information Science and Computer Equipment, and the Novosibirsk branch of the Chemical Machinery Scientific Research Institute.

The roundtable meeting was opened and chaired by Academician V.A. Koptug, USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department chairman and USSR Academy of Sciences vice-chairman (the report on the roundtable meeting was prepared by journal consultant V. Pirozhkov).

Results of the Development of Academic Science in Siberia

V.A. Koptug:

The establishment of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department was a daring experiment by the state, which proved the possibilities of the socialist system. Within a short time a scientific potential was created, which contributed to strengthening the scientific and technical base of the country and the increased prestige of Soviet science, and which had a direct influence on the development of production forces and upgrading the level of education and culture in the area. The department was awarded the Order of Lenin in 1982 for its successes.

The Siberian Department is guided in its activities by three principles as stipulated by its founders: faster development of comprehensive research on basic scientific problems, with a view to the steady acquisition of knowledge, on the basis of which the various practical problems can be resolved quickly; close ties with the national economy and active cooperation in the practical application of scientific achievements; and extensive participation by scientists in cadre training. These principles withstood the test of time. A proof of the acknowledgment of their efficiency is the formation of the Far Eastern and Ural Departments of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in the image of the Siberian Department and the Siberian Departments of VASKHNIL and the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences. The USSR AN SO created major scientific schools working on the cutting edge

of scientific and technical progress. The studies conducted here are distinguished by their high standard in the development of methods of mathematical modeling and means of automation.

The background in scientific developments, acquired in the past and steadily expanded, enables us to engage in applied research on a broad front.

A multiple-level system of interaction with the national economy has developed: direct relations with enterprises, sectorial institutes and design bureaus, long-term coordination plans for bilateral cooperation with ministries and departments, and implementation of assignments based on governmental scientific and technical target programs. Many of our developments, following their consideration by the USSR Gosplan and the Gosplan of the RSFSR and various ministries are included in state and sectorial 5-year plans.

The activities of the department helped to enhance the prestige of science in the eyes of economic and party leaders and the realization of the need for having a serious scientific base for the development of the area. It is an indicative fact that in its time the question of choosing a city where the headquarters of Siberian academic science would be located was discussed at length. Some people had no clear idea of whether or not science was needed, would it be useful or would it merely bring trouble. Today the situation has changed drastically. Obkoms, kraykoms and soviet agencies are vying for the creation of scientific institutions. In the past 5 years alone about 10 new institutes were opened in the area and cadres to staff them were trained.

One of the lessons learned in the development of science in Siberia is the fact that no efficient help can be given to the area without the development of basic research and consequent applied developments.

As we know, cadres are the foundation of serious science. Whereas in the first years of the existence of the department, specialists had to be invited from the European part of the country, the department not only entirely meets its needs but even supplies such scientists to the area. The essence of the system applied in training highly skilled cadres is the extensive participation of scientists in the work of the higher schools and the direct involvement of students in scientific activities. Novosibirsk State University is the base VUZ of the RSFSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education in improving the forms of interaction between higher schools and academic science, the automation of scientific research and the extensive use of computers in training. It has a specialized physics-mathematics and chemistry boarding school attended by about 500 adolescents from Siberia, the Far East, Kazakhstan and Central Asia. The experience acquired in interacting with academic institutes is being used and developed by the universities in Irkutsk, Krasnoyarsk, Kemerovo, Omsk, Tomsk, and Yakutsk.

A.S. Isayev, presidium chairman of the Krasnoyarsk Scientific Center, USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, director of the Forest and Timber Institute, academician:

In summing up the main results of the work of the Siberian Department, we must point out a factor such as the establishment of scientific centers in the main Siberian areas. They not only contribute to strengthening Siberian science but also broaden the influence of the department in the area. This is exemplified by the Krasnoyarsk Scientific Center, which has been developing particularly actively in the last decade. Today it includes the Institute of Forest and Timber imeni V.N. Sukachev, the Physics Institute imeni L.V. Kirenskiy, the Biophysics Institute, the Institute of Chemistry and Chemical Technology, the Computer Center, and the "Nauka" SKTB.

What was the main feature in the establishment of the center? Above all, the fact that each institute must have its own personality (it is unnecessary to duplicate establishments already existing within the department) and be an institute operating on the basis of high international standards. That is why the emphasis is on basic research while applied research already logically stems from it. It was oriented toward a close cooperation with VUZs in Krasnoyarsk. Currently a scientific-training-production complex is being created, involving the participation of machine building enterprises in the city, the university, the polytechnical institute and institutions of the academic center.

Departmental science accounts for about 70 percent of all scientific personnel in Krasnoyarsk Kray (and only 10 percent of candidates and doctors of sciences). The combination of these forces is one of the most important elements in our scientific-organizational and social activities. The leading scientists in the center are members of the council for scientific and technical progress of the kray party committee, which heads the implementation of the measures stipulated in the "Intensification-90" program approved for Krasnoyarsk Kray. It involves scientific developments in the center and the entire Siberian Department.

Councils for scientific and technical progress have been set up under all obkoms and kraykoms in the area. A.D. Korobkin, head of the department of science and scientific institutions, Novosibirsk CPSU Obkom, doctor of economic sciences, spoke on the main areas of party leadership of science and on the activities of the council under the Novosibirsk CPSU Obkom:

The basis of the long-term activities of the oblast party organization is the "Program for the Development and Intensification of the Oblast Economy during the 12th 5-Year Period and the Period until the Year 2000," which was drafted on the initiative of the council for

scientific and technical progress of the CPSU Obkom and was approved with a decree of the obkom buro and the oblast executive committee.

The program includes some 1,500 measures related to production reconstruction and technical retooling, perfecting management and improving the organization of labor, the economy and the efficient utilization of material and labor resources. Its successful implementation will result in a substantial increase in the average annual growth rates of the overall public product. Most of the economic effect should be obtained through the application of new technological processes, production mechanization and automation and use of computers. The plan calls for tripling the production of new types of commodities, above all machines and apparatus and increasing the production of items bearing the state Emblem of Quality.

Recommendations for the intensification of the urban and rayon economy were drafted and the main indicators for the 12th 5-Year Plan were formulated jointly by the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department Institute of Economics and organization of industrial production, the oblast executive committee planning commission and the statistical administration.

The "Party Guidance in the Acceleration of Scientific and Technical Progress" section was set up with a view to coordinating the activities of social scientists and party, soviet and trade union workers, under the CPSU obkom. The section was also assigned the formulation of scientific-methodical recommendations for the study, summation and dissemination of the experience of party committees in putting to practical use efficient ways and means of party leadership of scientific and technical progress.

The Siberian Department tries to integrate and make use of the experience of scientific, soviet and economic organizations. Once every 5 years, on the eve of the consideration of the next 5-year plan, an all-union conference on the development of production processes in Siberia is held at the Novosibirsk Akademgorodok, attended by senior personnel of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR and RSFSR ministers, managers of Siberian party kraykoms and obkoms, chairmen of kray and oblast executive committees, enterprise directors, etc. The scientific results of the last conference (1985) were discussed by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and recommended for use in the Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the Country in the 12th 5-Year Period and the Period Until the Year 2000.

The Siberia Scientific Research Program has become a major tool in the unification of forces for solving problems related to the accelerated development of the region. It purpose is actively to contribute to the comprehensive development of natural resources in the area and to the development of its production forces.

The idea of such a program, Academician A.A. Trofimuk, director of the Institute of Geology and Geophysics, first deputy chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department and chairman of the scientific council for the Siberia Program, said, originated in 1977. Preparations for its implementation required, above all, to take an inventory of the scientific forces in the area and to include as coperformers the scientific institutions of the Academy of Medical Sciences, VASKHNIL, departments and VUZs. All of this was accomplished within a rather short time. The program was ready by 1978. More than 40 of its sections deal with problems of surveying and extracting minerals, comprehensive processing of raw materials, efficient utilization of land and water resources, development of new materials and technologies, and environmental protection. Especially important among them are the study of the development of the West Siberian petroleum and natural gas complex, the Kuznetsk and Kansk-Achin coal basins, and the economic development of the BAM zone. In 1986 more than 700 organizations from 90 ministries and departments under union and republic jurisdiction participated in the implementation of the program.

Application Problems

"Application is one of our most difficult problems. The term 'application' itself presumes the use of power which, in our case, is unnatural. What is natural is something else, when the production process takes up and quickly puts to use anything new which is provided by technical progress, anything which leads to the development of new products of interest to society. This can occur only when the use of scientific achievements is not only not bothersome but also profitable to the producers. Unfortunately, for the time being there is no efficient mechanism which would make it necessary and profitable for all participants in the production process to make use of scientific achievements. Clearly, this is one of the main reasons for the huge losses suffered by our economy, caused by the weak or delayed use of the achievements of science." This excerpt taken from the address by R.I. Salganika, deputy director of the Institute of Cytology and Genetics, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, reflects the assessments of the participants in the discussion on the course of the utilization in the national economy of the results of scientific research. Specific developments by Siberian scientists were listed, the extensive use of which could yield major economic results. They include blast welding, plasma and laser technologies, industrial radiation boosters, means of automation, new catalysts and medical preparations.

The bank of departmental developments, which are either ready or virtually ready for use and which are consistent with global standards includes more than 500 items, said V.Ye. Nakoryakov, deputy chairman of the Siberian Department, director of the Institute of Thermal Physics and USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member. This stock is being replenished

steadily. Descriptions of such developments have been included in six collections which have been stored in a computer memory bank. The scientists are trying to supply needed information quickly to potential consumers via any available channel, ranging from participation in exhibits to distributing catalogues which describe prototypes, work principles and test results. However, many of them have still not found any practical use.

V.A. Koptug:

Until recently, we were not sufficiently active in applying our developments in industrial sectors in the Russian Federation. Currently the situation is changing. Cooperation contracts have been concluded with 12 RSFSR ministries and work is being done in that area. A subprogram entitled "RSFSR Scientific and Technical Progress" has been formulated. At the same time, we are studying in all Siberian krais and oblasts specific local problems and organizing experimental-industrial testing of solutions suggested by scientists. Good results have been achieved in this area by the Institute of Problems for the Development of the North in Tyumen. The Republic Engineering and Technical Center for Reinforcing Coating in Tomsk is successfully developing. The creation of such centers is a promising trend in our activities.

A.A. Trofimuk:

The following figures give an idea of the scale of implementation of the measures stipulated in the Siberian Program: the estimated effectiveness of its recommendations exceeds 15 rubles per ruble of cost. Actually, in 1986 the figure was in the vicinity of 2.5 rubles. Why? The main reason lies in the imperfection of sectorial economic management in the region. For example, there is a literal Tower of Babel of departments at the petroleum and gas deposits in Western Siberia and each one of them is beating its own drum. Some prepare stocks, others are building, others are procuring, others are extracting, and so on.

Why not combine this area within one powerful enterprise? It should be given two indicators: the first is the fact that the extraction of petroleum and natural gas must increase steadily. The second is that production costs must be stabilized on the present level. At that point a surveyor, for example, would consider how to obtain at a low cost information on what is found where. Today everything seems to be upside-down: geologists are trying to drill as many wells as possible (in my estimate, twice the necessary number, although each test drill costs 2-3 million rubles). This is because their main indicator is the drilling meter. It is precisely this meter that they are pursuing in order to obtain funds, tractors, etc. Their activities are measured by outlays, which are growing, while the quality of proven reserves is declining significantly.

Such a powerful facility would be interested in scientific developments as well. Were I to submit a method with the help of which survey efficiency could be doubled, they would not let me go. Now, they say that they do not need this, for this would mean drilling only half the number of wells.

One of the purposes of the Siberia Program is to prepare the opening of a new petroleum base in Eastern Siberia. However, no resources for it are left, for everything is going to Western Siberia. But if priority is given to meeting the two indicators only, the enterprise itself would try to develop deposits which are today much more profitable.

Question: Andrey Alekseyevich, why is it that for several decades the problem of the Baykal has not been under the jurisdiction of the Siberian Department. All of a sudden, now, Siberian science is being blamed for failing to ensure the necessary developments?

From the very start we said that in no case should a paper combine be built on the Baykal shore. But the combine was built and now we are being told that science should make the water clean. Is this a serious approach?

V.A. Koptug:

Today it has been admitted that this was not serious. The point is that those who made the decisions were not held responsible.

A.A. Trofimuk:

Why is it that our appeals do not meet with proper response? Because there was no unity within the Academy of Sciences. Some members of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium said that the Baykal should be used, that no problem existed. Then, things assumed a catastrophic turn. We already knew that unless things change Baykal would disappear before the end of the century. The answer we received was that the country needs cellulose and that two or three more combines could be built.

I put great trust in the latest decrees of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on the protection of Baykal's natural resources. Many of my colleagues object as follows: if 5 years from now the Baykal cellulose-paper combine has been reorganized for the ecologically cleaner production of furniture, why waste millions of rubles to channel its effluents to the Irkut?

It is entirely clear that unless this is done, for 5 more years the combine will be polluting the lake. At the same time, we must properly organize the chemical treatment of its effluents and feed the Irkut with more or less

treated waste water. However, we must bear in mind that as of now the Baykal combine is filled with waste of its treatment and no one has thought about how to dispose of it.

A.S. Isayev:

Andrey Alekseyevich, this proves yet once again that the sewer system has been absolutely unplanned from the economic or ecological viewpoints and is only postponing the solution of the problem of the Baykal combine for an indefinite time.

A.A. Trofimuk:

The building of any other production facility will also need the draining of sewage water and no other facility can be built now.

V.A. Koptug:

We support the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution. It has been acknowledged today that the building of the Baykal cellulose-paper combine was an error. From the very beginning of the Siberian Department held and struggled for that view. Naturally, we did not do everything we should have. It is proper to criticize us. However, we should be criticized not for what we are being abused now. The necessary materials which reflected our viewpoint were submitted within the stipulated deadlines. Many of our recommendations, however, were ignored. Why? We insisted that the Academy of Sciences hold a serious conference in order to formulate a uniform viewpoint. Our voice, however, was not heard. That is why we believe that in this respect we are being unfairly blamed.

However, we should have done some of the work instead of the various departments. We should have provided the directive-issuing authorities with a thorough study of advanced technologies and an integral ecological policy. Not because the departments could not do it themselves but because they were unwilling to do so. As a rule, they avoid such studies. Yet frequently partial information is like disinformation. The USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department deserves to be severely blamed for the fact that our leading authorities were deprived of such information. Today we are taking steps to correct the existing situation.

Question: has a procedure been established for consulting with the Siberian Department?

Unfortunately, the Siberian Department becomes involved in most projects too late, most frequently when we ourselves begin to demand the necessary data for an expert evaluation.

A.S. Isayev:

The Siberian Department must participate in the discussions held when preparing a project and not after it has been completed and we are ordered to substantiate it. For example, in the past we were ordered to study the quality of the water if the runway of a water reservoir would be flooded without having removed the trees. The very formulation of the question is immoral. Unquestionably, the runway must be prepared and the timber must be cut and used. The first GES where even basic order will have been brought at the time of the flooding will be the Boguchan. Next comes the Sredne-Yeniseyskaya! We must not allow a repetition of what took place at the Bratsk GES, where millions of cubic meters of timber were flooded, already cut off but not removed on time.

Today it is a question of the building of the Turukhan GES. This is exceptionally necessary to the country, taking into consideration the current situation with the availability of energy, the difficulties we have encountered in connection with the Chernobyl accident and the implementation of the program for building nuclear power plants. However, virtually no ecological studies are being made. A water reservoir will be built in the tundra, 1,300 kilometers long, on permafrost! There will be a mass of ecological consequences! Thus, no one took into consideration that as a result of the commissioning of the Krasnoyarsk GES the Yenisey would no longer be able to freeze for a length of 120 kilometers. This, however, influenced the climate. The humidity changed, corrosion increased, the airport had to be moved elsewhere, morbidity increased, etc.

That is why the ecological substantiation of projects must be a matter of prime importance. Here as well the Siberian Department must always have its weighty say.

V.A. Koptug:

Recently, on the instruction of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the Siberian Department set up a commission to make ecological-economic studies of the project for the Katun GES. Considering the growing interest shown by the public in large-scale projects which could affect nature, on the recommendation of the USSR AN SO Presidium, the newspaper NAUKA V SIBIRI launched a discussion on the project itself and on the conclusions of the commission of experts.

V.K. Shumnyy, director of the USSR AN SO Institute of Cytology and Genetics, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member:

I entirely share the views supported today by the Siberian Department. The most efficient means of applying scientific results is planning. As early as the 1920s, N.I. Vavilov developed a state system for introducing plant and animal species. If the species is good, it is used automatically and its area of dissemination and system of seed cultivation is formulated.

However, the moment we deal with technology, industry and medicine, difficulties arise. I believe that we shall not eliminate them as long as here as well the same type of specific criteria which are applied in strain testing of plants have not been applied.

It seems to me that perhaps better than anywhere else in the Union, a system of interaction has been developed between VASKHNIL and the Siberian Department. Our departments set up a coordination council which selects projects ready for application and makes decisions on their implementation. Together with the VASKHNIL Siberian Department we have done a great deal. This has included dozens of plant strains and animal breeds. The first strain with which our cooperation began was that of Novosibirskaya-67 spring wheat. In the past this wheat was planted on as much as 3 million hectares. We jointly developed winter strains of rye and wheat. The problem of winter crops in Siberia is already being solved in some areas.

The country has 14 agrobiological centers. Their prime task is to use achievements in biology and genetics in selection work. Such a center has been set up in Siberia as well. It is headed by our institute and several VASKHNIL institutes. Both the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department and the VASKHNIL Siberian Department have developed a good base for solving the problems of the biocenters. The main problem is to eliminate interdepartmental barriers by setting up joint subdivisions and combining material and technical resources. What is the legal base for such activities?

It is amazing but a fact that although understanding and acknowledging all of this, the departments continue to function on the basis of their strictly personal interests, and on a self-isolating basis, setting themselves apart through their own instructions. All that is being done by different departments jointly is based most frequently on personal contacts and mutual trust. This is good but a legal foundation should be provided as well.

Yu.A. Novoselov, deputy chairman, VASKHNIL Siberian Department Presidium, candidate of agricultural sciences:

We too are concerned with the problem of the connection between science and production. Today the science of agriculture is blamed for everything, including harvest shortfalls caused by poor weather conditions, violations of labor discipline in sovkhozes and kolkhozes, low cow productivity, etc. It would be profitable to combine the high exigency toward science with the maximal utilization of efficient scientific developments. Unfortunately, the scale and efficiency of their application vary a great deal.

Some order does exist in selection. An efficient system has been developed in the country. In this area there are no obstacles, there is no one to be fought. Agronomists in sovkhozes and kolkhozes are looking for strains, trying to obtain them at any price. However, problems in their

distribution exist. In livestock breeding it is simpler, there is a network of breeding farms under the direct jurisdiction of the Agroprom. No one else has the right to issue plans or impose decisions. As a result of a number of reorganizations, however, the seed growing farms are under the jurisdiction of the rayon which demands, above all, that its plan be fulfilled. They must frequently deliver seed grain which, two months later, they will be requesting back from the state. This problem remains unsolved.

The process of the utilization of developments in mechanization is much more complex. After testing and approving a new model, the Gosagroprom would decide on its manufacturing. This becomes the job of the Ministry of Agricultural and Tractor Machine Building. However, the ministry is not interested in producing a new model, for this means a great deal of trouble.

There have been cases in which scientific developments have been waiting implementation for 20 years and have not been applied extensively. If you want a new model machine, do it yourself. Matters have reached so far that enterprises of the Selkhoztekhnika in Novosibirsk are beginning to manufacture computers. No other way is possible, for specialized enterprises are virtually not supplying kolkhozes and sovkhozes with computer equipment.

Yu.I. Borodin, presidium chairman, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Siberian Department, member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences:

We have gained some experience in the practical utilization of scientific development. In particular, we make extensive use of a method we consider very promising, that of practical science centers, laboratories and offices. Today the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences SO has more than 30 of them, 10 of which in Novosibirsk. Every year tens of thousands of Siberians are examined and treated in them. It is there that new methods of diagnosis and treatment of various diseases are tested. This brings medical science considerably closer to practical health care and shortens the time for putting scientific achievements to practical use.

We are considering the organization of interdepartmental cooperation between medical scientific research institutes and enterprises and industrial associations of different ministries and departments in order to speed up the conversion of scientific developments to industrial prototypes.

We are currently trying to organize two other forms of interinstitute cooperation. One of them is a scientific association on the supra-institute level for the solution of specific medical problems and, particularly, the struggle against vernal encephalitis, which is a very important and urgent problem in the eastern parts of the country. A task force is being set up which will include scientific research epidemiological and microbiological institutes

in Vladivostok and Irkutsk, and institutes for clinical and experimental medicine in Novosibirsk. The USSR Academy of Sciences SO Institute of Bioorganic Chemistry has agreed to participate in this project.

The other form of interinstitute cooperation which we are planning to introduce in our system is that of regional scientific-medical centers. In particular, a suggestion has been approved on combining the medical institutes in Novosibirsk within a Novosibirsk USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department scientific and medical center.

The main purpose in the search for a variety of ways and means of cooperation is upgrading the efficiency of medical scientific research and accelerating the practical utilization of its results. Here as well a number of unsolved problems remain. For example, who should be in charge of the extensive application of scientific development? There are more than enough organizations to regulate (and, frequently, frankly speaking, to hinder) such work. In our system this includes the USSR Ministry of Health Pharmacological Committee, and the corresponding departments of the ministries of health of the USSR and the RSFSR. Yet, to this day there is no authority or subunit directly in charge of problems of application.

'Area of Application'

In order to have a stimulating influence on the development of production forces a scientific idea should cover the stage of applied research and development, assume the aspect of a new material, technology or tool and prove its progressive nature. Basic research is the starting point of this process and the last stage is the practical application of a new development.

V.A. Koptug:

It is clear today that the founders of the Siberian Department underestimated the obstacles on the way to the practical utilization of scientific developments. Perhaps at that time such barriers were not all that obvious. The hope that our industry itself will take the results of basic research and put them through the stage of experimental design and experimental production operations not justified then, nor is it now. Let us frankly say that we are not entirely clear as to how this will take place within the framework of the new economic mechanism. The moment it became clear that industry is both unwilling and unable and, furthermore, that nothing encourages it to use our developments, M.A. Lavrentyev suggested that an "application area" be set up near Akademgorodok, a network of sectorial design bureaus. The idea was implemented but we did not obtain expected results. At the present time virtually all design bureaus in this "area" have become sectorial institutes.

Our ideal is to have a strong academic institute with its own design bureaus and experimental production facilities. The advantages of such an organization has been confirmed by 30 years of practical experience of the Nuclear Physics Institute, which has followed this system from the start.

A.N. Skriskiy, director of the USSR AN SO Institute of Nuclear Physics, academician:

The first project which was completed in the complex of installations of our institute was the experimental production building. This is a good indicator of the attention which was paid to this matter. The reason was not that already then, 30 years ago, the future problems of application were clearly conceived. High energy physics and elementary particle physics are inconceivable without large one-of-a-kind systems which industry could not produce. That is why in order to ensure the development of our area of knowledge we needed our own production facility for specialized equipment. The good production and design base enabled the institute, as early as the 1960s, to formulate and successfully to solve the problem of developing specialized equipment for industry. This is based on developments which are the most important aspect of our basic research. Today the volume of our procurements within the country and abroad is worth approximately 10 million rubles annually. For an academic institute this is quite a high figure. In all likelihood, in the current 5-year period it will be increased half as much again.

Dozens of our systems are at work in the national economy but hundreds are needed. Obviously, the institute cannot meet such great demand. This is a matter for industry. A number of decisions on a rather high level have been made on this account. However, for the time being there has been no answer to the question of who will undertake such production and when. Organizing serial production is today the bottleneck in the sequence from basic science to widespread utilization of developments in the national economy.

One of the variants in our present efforts to solve the problem is related to the creation of technological equipment for microelectronic production. The organizations of the Ministry of Electronics Industry have been participating, for the second year running, in the development of such equipment for microelectronics such as high-voltage implants. We hope that such cooperation will facilitate the conversion to series production, at the point when the systems will be ready for production and the specific need for them will have been established. Our local variants could contribute something useful to this problem. However, we must seek economical ways which would lead from a situation of "application" to that of "industrial espionage," i.e., when people will be literally looking for developments and the question of who would be the first to apply them would be of vital importance to industry itself.

A.A. Trofimuk:

The "application area" consists of units under the jurisdiction of different ministries. They think as follows: it is we who have set up this design bureau and, consequently, it is ours. At best you can have no more than a 50 percent share of it providing that you could convince us that this is needed for the project.

I am quite closely affiliated with the design bureau for geophysical instrument manufacturing, which was set up by the Ministry of Geology on the basis of our ideas. The bureau worked more or less normally for 2 years, after which it no longer accepted our requests. We told its managers: "Comrades, you and we could create an entire set of methods and equipment which would revolutionize the process of looking for minerals." The answer was this: "The Ministry of Geology is short of theodolites, for which reason we are making theodolites." End of conversation.

The idea of an "application area" is good. However, at its very start no thought was given to double jurisdiction. The "area" must be unified. It should have only one manager. How could people fail to do this from the start! The "area" must be under the jurisdiction of an authority which will bear responsibility for application processes in the country, such as the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology. In that case all ministerial barriers and related difficulties would be eliminated. Basic science would have supportive partners who could accept its ideas, and not sectorial (which, naturally, are also important) but intersectorial and more important ones, which, at present, no single ministry is willing to become.

A.P. Burdakov, director of the Novosibirsk branch, Scientific Research Institute for Chemical Machinery, USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, doctor of technical sciences:

Let us note the substantial improvements in the situation with the interaction among academic and sectorial organizations: the Katalizator MNTK has been set up, which, in addition to the Catalysis Institute, includes the Katalizator SKTB of the Ministry of Chemical Industry; an intersectorial center is being set up for plasma and reinforcement technologies on the basis of the facilities of the Institute of Thermal Physics and the Novosibirsk branch of the Scientific Research Institute of Chemical Machine Building. However, problems exist as well. The point is that the organization, which has converted to self-financing (our ministry has converted to that system) is not interested, from the viewpoint of economic well-being, in undertaking long-term projects. I believe that if the nuclear power industry had developed on the basis of self-financing it would not have existed today in our country. The main task of the "application area" is to apply in the national economy the scientific developments of the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences

Siberian Department, which are precisely of a revolutionizing nature. The fact that the organizations within the "application area" are located in the area of Akademgorodok allows the various sectors to make extensive use of the achievements of academic science, ranging from consultations with specialists on all levels to the scientific support of applied developments, provided by the academic institutes.

A.A. Deribas, chief of the SKB for hydropulse equipment, USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, doctor of physical and mathematical sciences:

It is entirely obvious that the Academy of Sciences must offer finished prototypes which could be used by industry. Life has proved that efforts to find a partner who would complete a project are worthless. Sectorial institutes easily cooperate as long as it is a question of acquiring information on new developments, for they must know everything that is taking place. However, the moment it becomes a question of investing real resources, all interest is lost.

The SKB for hydropulse equipment is a cost-accounting enterprise. We may be asked to provide a system. When the system is ready and goes to the plant it turns out that there is no one to install it, there is no one to service it, the wages of the operators have not been determined, and so on. As a rule, a great deal of time is lost in solving such problems, sometimes an entire 5-year period. Meanwhile, the system remains idle. As our practical experience has indicated, under cost-accounting conditions the enterprises are oriented toward current problems. This makes long-term developments more difficult, for no one is placing orders for them. In our view, the only solution is to assign the financing of such new developments to the GKNT. Currently it is virtually impossible to talk any enterprise into financing the creation of equipment for future use.

When Industry is Incapable of Application

A.V. Rzhannov, deputy chairman, USSR AN SO Presidium, director of the Institute of Semiconductor Physics, academician:

The following question was asked here: is industry unwilling or unable to use our developments? Both are true. Sometimes it is unwilling, due to the lack of a corresponding economic mechanism. Frequently, however, it cannot. Today there are trends which determine the pace of scientific and technical progress. Microelectronics is among the most important among them. This is a science-intensive production. The main cadres in this area work at the Academy of Sciences, for which reason industry frequently fails to understand the new ideas. We are speaking in different tongues. For example, when we are discussing the fact that we have created so-called supergrids, on the basis of which many problems in electronics could be solved, industry does not know what this means.

The manufacturing of instruments for scientific research is a pressing problem.

Laboratory systems are used as prototypes of scientific instruments. In itself, the idea that on the basis of such systems industry should produce instruments is insane. This must be preceded by many stages of development, the correction of defects, etc. Such instruments, furthermore, should be produced in small series.

The second aspect of this problem is that the scientific research institute, in speaking of solving new problems, always raises the question of imports. But if we start buying everything we need, we would fall short of money. Even highly developed countries such as the United States purchase abroad only some of the equipment and they themselves sell some. This leads to the existence of a kind of reciprocal exchange, the result of which is a positive or a negative overall balance. In our country the balance is drastically negative. Does this mean, however, that we lack ideas and developments? No, it does not. Had we not had our own latest equipment and systems, we would have been unable to move science ahead. The point is that we are moving it ahead most uneconomically. We create isolated samples which, naturally, cost a great deal. Structurally, they are being made on the primitive level and are used frequently only by a single institute whereas, should we have a wide base for scientific instrument making, we could make Soviet science self-supporting and, furthermore, trade in the latest equipment. Even today, even with our extremely poor situation, we could produce modern instruments which would find customers abroad. This would provide us with money for imports. This requires some initial investments which, naturally, are substantial in terms of the Academy but quite small on a national scale. This would solve a major problem.

V.Ye. Nakoryakov:

In science-intensive production, basic and applied research and experimental design are combined within a single process, roughly the way this is done by the Institute of Nuclear Physics. The output would be not only instruments, basic facilities and computers but also lasers, accelerators, polymers, new drugs, etc. Some ten institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department could undertake such output. However, they lack a production base. An investment which, in terms of the entire country would be relatively small, would make possible the establishment of such a base and the realization of the existing potential.

According to the application system which has developed in the Siberian Department, the main emphasis is on including a development in the plan of a sector or enterprise. That is what we have been doing so far. Today many people are optimistic about the possibility of converting to self-support. At that point, it is being said, both enterprises and sectors would be grabbing all

of our innovations. I do not share this optimism. So far we can see only reduced numbers of economic contracts with ministries which have converted to cost-accounting.

Development Tasks and Problems

A.S. Alekseyev, director of the Novosibirsk Computer Center, academician:

The establishment of a large number of major scientific schools in a great variety of scientific areas is the result of the 30-year development of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department. These schools are valuable also because they have established a tradition of close interaction with each other. That is why many departmental projects deal with major comprehensive interdepartmental problems.

One of the efficient methods for the application of such developments is to participate, together with the interested ministries, in drafting CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees through which the efforts of several departments can be coordinated.

In order to develop such "strong" methods, a certain restructuring in Siberian science would be necessary. So far we have developed extensively by creating institutes, as requested by oblasts and krais, with uncontrolled scientific specialization. This process has led to a lagging in the scientific base in a number of new and very topical areas in which the comprehensive potential of the Siberian Department could be applied particularly well (such as microelectronics, computers, automation and software).

Based on a number of indications, we see the advent of a new wave in the scientific and technical revolution, related to the creation and extensive utilization of new means and technologies for the acquisition and processing of knowledge. Unfortunately we, at the Academy of Sciences, lack the necessary resources for the development of such technologies on the scale which has been maintained for the past few years in Japan and the United States. Such resources have either been dispersed among a variety of scientific areas, which has prevented them from reaching critical mass in order to achieve the necessary pace, or else have been invested in major but already stabilized scientific areas.

Obviously, one of the principal means of restructuring Siberian science would be to harness reserves and to reallocate funds in order to strengthen the most important areas. This should apply, above all, to software and, particularly, the technology of gathering and processing knowledge and the intellectualizing of technical systems. It is precisely in such areas that we could efficiently interact on a cooperative basis with our institutes.

In short, we must acquire a second life and new and essential resources.

T.I. Zaslavskaya, head of sector, USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, Institute of Economics and Organization of Industrial Production, academician:

The enhancement of the individual, and the fuller and efficient use of his labor and intellectual potential, motivating his creative energy and channeling it to serve the public interest, are decisive prerequisites in the acceleration of social development. But how to achieve the involvement of the individual in restructuring? We know that the behavior of the people is governed above all by interest and interest has an objective status in the social structure. Therefore, the human factor can be enhanced less with words than with the help of a strong and purposeful socioeconomic policy which would ensure the integration of individual and group (collective) interests, on the one hand, with those of society, on the other. Setting up a scientific base for the formulation of such a policy, assisting in its development and providing scientific control over its practical implementation are the most important tasks of economic sociology.

The following features are characteristic of this science. First, the lack of solution of many most important theoretical problems is due to the fact that until recently possibilities for the creative development of this science were extremely limited. Actually, a taboo had been imposed on the study of the various areas and processes of social life which demanded the prime attention of scientists. Efforts to review obsolete theoretical dogmas and make theory entirely consistent with practice met with a very cautious attitude and were frequently qualified as political errors.

Second, at the present time the applied aspect of economic sociology has been developed least of all. The studies themselves are still insufficiently consistent with the needs of restructuring. On the one hand, this is a manifestation of the inertia of scientists who have become accustomed to less binding "purely scientific" studies; on the other, for the time being most personnel of the administrative agencies are still unable not only clearly to formulate orders to science but also to use the results of the work done on the initiative of scientists.

In the light of this we deem it important substantially to accelerate the development of economic-sociological theory and to subordinate the choice and meaningful interpretation of its problems above all to the topical tasks of restructuring economic relations. We must also significantly improve the quality of scientific recommendations formulated by directive-issuing authorities and make them more businesslike, concrete and specific.

A.G. Granberg, director of the Institute of Economics and Organization of Industrial Production, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member:

In my view, the main shortcoming of our work is that we have paid relatively little attention to the study of the organizational and economic obstruction mechanism in the implementation of the national strategy of giving priority to the development of production forces in Siberia and the formulation of the necessary set of countermeasures.

Why are the developers of new technologies and technical facilities questioning the decisive power of the economic instruments for controlling scientific and technical progress? They have many reasons for this. The implementation of scientific achievements is objectively related to economic risk. This is a universal law. However, we assess economic risk differently from the people in the West. I would say the following: typical or our practice is the asymmetry of economic risk, i.e., one could lose a great deal from the application of a project but it is virtually impossible to benefit substantially. The economic manager has been trained to believe that if he were to obtain substantial real results from a technical novelty, it would be taken away from him and would be rapidly "reduced to a common denominator" (by confiscating profits, lowering prices, etc.). Meanwhile, the nonfulfillment of the plan by one or two percent because of the difficulties involved in mastering the production of a new item or developing a new technology would entail serious penalties and could wreck a person's career. Should we be amazed that people willing voluntarily to gamble on the basis of such rules are few? Therefore, we need guarantees that the results (the "superprofits") of initiative-minded economic managers will be kept by them and that insurance in attempts to apply innovations should be increased (with special funds and loans).

However, economic methods are not omnipotent, particularly in basic research and in the large-scale revolutionary trends in the development of equipment and technology. This, above all, is the area of strategic planning.

Our institute is developing a methodology for governmental scientific and technical programs, which should become the bearing structure of long-term plans. It is on the basis of such programs that state orders to enterprises and scientific organizations will be formulated. The system of governmental plan-orders, which will be introduced starting with 1988, should extensively apply to new production and technical innovations. Such plan-orders must be backed by resources on a priority basis. The state must assume the economic risk in the development of the most important areas of scientific and technical progress.

So far the science of economics has dealt very little with the economics of science. Clearly, our institute as well must change orientation. As a first step, we have created task forces for the study of economic efficiency and the

reasons for the slow dissemination of a number of major technical developments obtained by the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department.

V.Ye. Panin, director of the Institute of Physics of Strength and Materials Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member:

What is the nature of restructuring of domestic science? Intersectorial scientific and technical complexes have been set up in the most promising areas of scientific and technical progress. Basic and sectorial science and production facilities are integrated within them. In this case the problem of application does not arise. That is precisely the way I look at the contemporary organization of science.

Twenty-two MNTK [intersectorial scientific and technical complexes] have been created. However, what is this in terms of the national economy? Merely isolated little islands which can never make the weather. They must be expanded with a widespread system of regional MNTK. At that point we shall be able to meet all the needs of the national economy.

Yu.N. Molin, chairman of the editorial and publishing council, USSR AN SO, director of the Institute of Chemical Kinetics and Combustion, academician:

From the viewpoint of the development of basic science, the essential merit of Akademgorodok is that a number of institutes have been concentrated within a single area. Scientists can freely establish reciprocal contacts and it is very important for the tendency to maintain formal discipline and petty regulations not to suppress such a fruitful trend.

Many examples could be cited indicating that in our country many basic projects are comprehensive.

The most outstanding among them, perhaps, is the use of synchrotron radiation. This is a complex system on which a large number of research groups are working, increasing both basic and technological research. More significant, in my view, however, are the invisible contacts which take place in the course of this work on a daily basis. They yield tremendous results, for that which one was forced to invent alone in an isolated institute here could be borrowed "from a neighbor:" advice, a material, a method, a program, and so on. That is what is yielding tremendous benefits for us.

At the same time, we must realize that Siberian science does not encompass all of domestic science, not to mention world science. In developing basic research, it is particularly important always to feel that we are working on the cutting edge. Unless we do so, it means that we are simply wasting our time.

It is necessary, in this connection, to obtain fast information on what is being done, where and how, and to exchange ideas with a great variety of scientific schools both in the Soviet Union and abroad. This is helped by conferences, a continuous stream of which is being held in our country. However, even this is not enough.

Another channel for obtaining the latest information is inviting scientists. The facilities currently at our disposal at the Siberian Department (at this point I am referring to the question that Akademgorodok indeed needs a second breath) are unsuitable. We have no facilities for welcoming for rather long periods of time major scientists, both Soviet and foreign, who could lecture and work here. The hotel is short of rooms. This hinders the entire area, and the VUZs and institutes which could train higher skilled specialists: trainees, postgraduate students, and so on.

Efficient printed information is also needed. Of late the situation with obtaining information from abroad has been difficult. However, even at home we are unable to have order in this area. How long does it take for an article to be published in the journal of the Siberian Department? In the best journals, 1 year. Quite frequently it is as much as 2.5 years. Under contemporary conditions, when information becomes obsolete extremely quickly, this is simply scandalous. After 2.5 years nobody needs it. Why does this happen? Because we are saving paper. Publication deadlines are restricted not by the technology used in publishing an article but by restrictions in the size of publications. Such practices have long been rejected in the rest of the world, aware of the fact that they can only be harmful.

In order to enhance basic science urgent steps should be taken, which are particularly important in centers such as the one in Novosibirsk and in the other scientific centers of the USSR AN SO.

Yu.D. Tsvetkov, chief scientific secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member:

I would like to discuss some problems of the life in the academic centers of the Siberian Department.

A system for developing academic cities had been adopted in the past for a number of scientific centers in the area, consisting of comprehensive settlements with their independent engineering and technical systems and social infrastructure. This pursued a double objective: to create a sufficient concentration of scientific cadres to maintain informal contacts, which are needed in scientific work, and to ensure, under the difficult conditions of Siberia, a living standard which would keep the cadres there.

Unfortunately, this idea was not pursued to the end and today, as a rule, academic cities are parts of entire cities. Most of the people who live in them (some 60 percent in

Novosibirsk, for example) are totally unrelated to the USSR AN SO. As a result, the Academy uses its own resources to support the infrastructure of the entire population. An increasingly smaller share of such outlays benefit our associates.

What worsens this situation is the fact that it developed gradually and that the city authorities have become accustomed to it. As a result, most frequently development and building plans for the city do not take into consideration the building needs of academic cities.

A variety of ways of solving this problem exists. The simplest is to set up our own social infrastructure based on departmental rather than territorial principles. We do not consider this method socially fair. The only proper and natural solution of this situation, obviously, should be to make the urban authorities understand the fact that academic cities are like any other city rayon and that all services should participate in their operation and development systematically. Otherwise, after a short period of time, all appropriations for science would be absorbed by the steadily expanding infrastructure of urban districts. Housing remains the most pressing social problem of all scientific centers in the Siberian Department. Although as a whole, during the 11th 5-year period the completion of housing remained on the level of the 10th, waiting time has remained virtually the same. This proves that the amount of capital investments in housing for the Siberian Department has long been unsatisfactory.

A.P. Derevyanko, director of the Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member:

Why when it becomes a question of the need to upgrade the role of the humanities the main question, that of the resources it needs, is not solved? This is puzzling. Generally speaking, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology is not in the habit of allocating special funds for a humanitarian problem, as is being done in the case of the natural sciences. Yet the need for this does exist! A selection must be made of topics which are relevant for the entire country. We are ready to participate in such competition.

Greater attention should be paid by the humanities, history in particular, to the study of contemporary processes, relations with practical work, etc. Such studies can be made on the basis of factual data. So far, however, a number of problems of the utilization of archives and statistical data remain unsolved. And even if current materials can be obtained by hook or by crook and interesting results are achieved on the basis of sociological studies, the publication of works on contemporary problems, pressing problems even more so, which expose negative aspects, is extremely difficult. Here is an example: the fourth volume of the "History of the Siberian Working Class" came out. Our specialists had to lug

suitcases filled with publications, to prove that the figures and facts which had been cited in the work were public knowledge and could be released.

V.A. Koptug:

Indeed, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology does not finance the social sciences. Who should deal with this? There are no sectors with whom we could sign contracts, yet these same sectors should be helped.

R.S. Vasilyevskiy, deputy director, USSR AN SO Institute of History, Philology and Philosophy, doctor of historical sciences:

Today the social sciences are in a difficult situation. They are obviously trailing behind the needs of society in their development. They need restructuring. Humanities in Siberia have a large number of topics, the study of which would be both useful and instructive. This includes a summation of the historical experience in the development of Siberia, developing problems of the interaction between scientific and technical and social progress, and the study of the sociocultural development of the peoples of Siberia. However, we lack the strength to do this. This requires certain outlays. If we are seriously considering to upgrade the role of the social sciences, such problems must be solved.

Yu.L. Yershov, rector, Novosibirsk State University, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member:

The Siberian Department began above all by securing the cadres it needed. This perhaps isolated example proved to be socially significant. Quite interesting documents were drafted on the restructuring of higher and secondary specialized schools. The experience of our university has been reflected in them. The task which faces VUZs today is the integration between science and education, which we have already solved. A specific problem facing our university is the integration of production with education. The scientific research center of the university is one of the channels for the application of developments of the Siberian Department. We could achieve a new quality leap if, along with developments, we supply industry with graduates related to such developments. Another problem is the organization of "mini-wholesale" training in the new areas (today this is just as difficult as opening a new shop in a plant).

The material facilities of the higher schools are unsatisfactory. The documents include the general principles according to which restructuring should take place. They include establishing direct relations with organizations to whom we assign specialists. This would make it possible to provide material assistance to the VUZs, including capital construction. Novosibirsk University interacts with many enterprises in the area but the only organization which is receiving a stable supply of our graduates is the Siberian Department. It, however, is not

providing us the help we need, particularly in capital construction, which we need so urgently. We turn to the oblast executive committee which tells us that if the Siberian Department would agree to release some of its construction funds they would support us. The ministry tells us that if the department is not building something for us it means that it does not need us. And if it does not, perhaps we should closed down altogether? So there!

I.M. Bobko, director, Institute of Software and Computer Equipment, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences corresponding member:

The school reform is marking time. Major actions must be taken within the education system. One such action, in our view, is school computerization. Computers and software are tools, methods which can substantially enhance all public education activities.

Aware of this, the Siberian Department has suggested to set up in Akademgorodok an institute which would be the base for the advancement of software and computers in the schools. The institute is only 1 year old. It was started, as they say, from scratch. Computerization is something new. We are seriously relying on the major help of other departments and organizations. The Siberian Department is helping us but our contacts should be more direct.

Today computers can influence the solving of problems of vocational guidance, and help school students in choosing a profession. The institute's collective is engaged in the development of special software and the creation of systems which would help teachers in class and outside the school.

Children's songs, booklets and shows are quite richly saturated with moral principles. Let us now consider the software which we must give to the schools. This would be either a computer game which does not contain any moral aspect or a program which has preserved the traditions of classical literature for children. We are following the second path. Today some Western countries would like to purchase our education programs, realizing the serious work being done in the educational and methodical aspects of the matter.

Here is another remark. The equipment we are receiving today does not satisfy either programmers, schools, method workers or practical engineers. The quality of computers should be substantially improved.

V.A. Koptug:

Education means not only cadres but also molding the mind. We know what a university is and what the computerization of schools needs. We are helping and we shall continue to help to the best of our possibilities in providing them with the necessary facilities. But where can we find the money to do this truly well?

In summing up the results of the discussion, V.A. Koptug said:

We have scored a great deal of achievements in basic and applied research. Some of them were briefly mentioned here. The main emphasis was on problems of supplying the national economy with the achievements of science: a major backlog exists, which so far has been poorly used. Another problem is that of the further development of the Siberian Department in accordance with the needs of socioeconomic progress. Some problems we can solve ourselves and are doing so by improving the organization of research and concentrating our forces in the main areas.

The extensive use of the achievements of academic science is in the interests of developing the production forces of the area. The most important national economic complexes must improve the practice of consulting with the department and using scientific and ecological expertise.

The scientific and technical revolution accelerated the processes of renovation of knowledge, technology and equipment. This formulates special requirements concerning the speed with which developments can be used by the national economy. We need a system which would enable us rapidly to master new prototypes and to test and prove their efficiency. Our institutes must have experimental design and production facilities. Attention should be paid to the development, on a new basis, of relations between academic and sectorial science. We cannot resolve by ourselves these and many other problems. The resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress direct us toward restructuring in the organization and management of science on a national scale. We approve and support the objective of including science in production and making it the base of revolutionary restructuring and are doing everything we can to ensure its implementation.

The new economic mechanism calls for broadening the autonomy of enterprises and their conversion to self-financing. We already have some experience in interacting with ministries and plants operating on a cost-accounting basis. One of the results which worries us is the reduced volume of economic contracts. We are trying to understand what will happen at the point where the old and new economic mechanisms come together. Would this be to the detriment of science? In the final account, the use of the acquired scientific potential is a national problem. Let us hope that the present discussion will provide a new impetus in interpreting the ways for the further development of science both for us and for anyone who is involved with the acceleration of scientific and technical progress in the country.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

Global Problems and Microbiology

18020005d Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17,
Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 67-76

[Article by Georgiy Aleksandrovich Zavarzin, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, head of laboratory at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Microbiology]

[Text] The scale at which the world around us is changing has become a source of concern for the future of mankind. Its study has demanded a great deal of new thinking in the areas of both social and natural science research. A characteristic feature of such changes in natural scientific thinking has been the increasingly frequent mention of V.I. Vernadskiy, compared with the preceding period, when Charles Darwin was being mentioned with equal frequency. This means that today attention is being focused on the interaction among rather than merely the origin of a number of natural objects. Indeed, the development of the theory of evolution for a century has led to a sufficiently profound understanding of the ways followed in the evolution of nature. However, the pace of a natural evolution has become incomparable with that of the progress achieved by human society, which is changing at such a speed and with such a scope that we can no longer speak of any adaptation to the environment, for the environment is changing significantly (and sometimes is even destroyed) in the course of the life of a single generation.

Still recently civilization was based on the idea of extensive development. Politically, it was embodied, in particular, in colonial seizures and in efforts to redive the world in favor of one country or another. Recent decades have revealed the futility of such policy. The dream of colonizing other worlds, related to the penetration of mankind into outer space, is also related to the idea of extensive development. However, space research led to an acknowledgment of the uniqueness and limitations of the earth. Hopes for extensive growth were replaced by an awareness of the relative limitations of living space. Under these conditions, development is possible only within the framework of a new, a scientifically substantiated interrelationship between society and nature. Consequently the interpretation of such constantly changing relations becomes a main task.

This leads to the appearance of a concept of a society which must advance under the conditions of the physical limitation of natural resources needed for its intensive development. The global situation, related to the conversion to intensive development, and awareness of the inevitably growing interconnection among various areas on earth are assuming prime significance. What could be expected in the forthcoming decades? According to numerous forecasts, the population in the industrialized countries will stabilize, although the expansion of cities, industry and transportation will continue, which will lead to an additional loss of first-rate farmland. Hence inevitably the problem arises of the intensification of

agricultural output. Industry will grow with fewer specific outlays of environmental resources thanks to the use of low-energy production facilities and wasteless technology. However, the pressure exerted by industry on the environment is unlikely to decline. The use of nonrecoverable resources will become increasingly costly to society, for extraction conditions are worsening steadily. However, even recoverable resources are threatened, both as a result of the reduced size of the arable land, losses in humus, affecting the overall fertility of the soil, the increased scarcity of fresh water and the declining genetic variety of the vegetal and animal world. Furthermore, global anthropogenic changes in the climate are also possible.

This indicates that it is above all two key features that can be efficiently controlled by man: the power industry and the base for renewable resources. Obviously, in the case of the power industry we need a strict policy of conservation, which yields the fastest and ecologically safest benefits. The so-called alternate sources of energy are by no means so ecologically safe as they may appear. In any case, understandably, in the next decades the power industry will essentially develop on the basis of natural gas, petroleum, coal and uranium.

The strategy governing the attitude toward renewable resources is overwhelmingly based on the possibilities of biology and related sciences. In the broad sense, it presumes a type of development of the biosphere which can ensure the well-being of the entire population on earth. It is important to emphasize here that the theory of the biosphere rests on basic natural scientific knowledge and cannot be limited to a single scientific discipline, for it is an obviously interdisciplinary area. Therefore, the interests of basic and applied science come together at the point of the need for a single "systemic" picture of the surrounding world.

This leads to the most important conclusion of the intolerability of erecting barriers among the individual scientific disciplines, departmentalism and obstructions in the fast "horizontal" exchange of information and expertise. The need for and possibility of having a precise, strict and fast evaluation of indirect and remote consequences of any change made in the area of scientific and technical and social progress is a characteristic feature of the new style of thinking. Mastering the new style of thinking presumes the creation of an adequate organizational structure of scientific institutions, the USSR Academy of Sciences in particular.

What is the role of microbiology within the set of contemporary natural sciences? In order to observe the continuity of this presentation, I shall not discuss the problem of medical microbiology and biotechnology, each one of which deserves special consideration. It may seem, initially, that microbiology is involved in the solution of excessively specific problems in the study of

the world around us and that the outlook of the microbiologist is restricted to a petri dish and that the knowledge of microbiology is of secondary importance to a modern natural scientist. I shall try to prove that this is by no means the case.

Microbes and Biosphere

The biosphere is the product of historical development, for which reason each one of its subsequent stage is superimposed on the previous one. The first biosphere of the earth is that of microorganisms or, more precisely, bacteria. Today we have an incomparably better idea of this most ancient biosphere than we had 10 years ago, largely thanks to the successes achieved by Soviet geologists. The biosphere of the distant past had been entirely developed 2 billion years ago. So-called microfossils, the study of which enables us to compare them with today's living organisms, have been perfectly preserved, proving that, generally speaking, they were the same type of microorganisms as are our "contemporaries." Naturally, only individual forms have been preserved and been identified. However, based on their combination, we could assume that many organisms in contemporary communities were present during those distant times.

In addition to such so-called indication forms, there also exists an independent system of proofs, based on traces left in minerals and rocks under the influence of animate matter. Stromatolites, which are laminated rock fossils, which took shape in shallow waters, covered by strata of deposits of blue-green algae (cyanobacteria, in modern terminology) are more than 2 billion years old. Carbon of organic origin has been found in Precambrian rocks. Finally, some minerals have a type of isotope structure typical of biological objects. All of these proofs confirm the existence of a bacterial biosphere, starting with the appearance of the first sedimentary rocks in geological chronicles more than 3.5 billion years old. Furthermore, they prove that about 2 billion years ago the biochemical cycles of elements which determine their conversion and the shifting of their compounds had already become significantly similar to those of today. The study of contemporary cycles indicates that only bacteria act as catalytic agents during some of their stages. Examples are found in nitrogen fixation, the restoration of sulfates in sulfuric acid, the forming of methane gas, and others.

In their study of the system of reactions which take place with the interaction between bacteria and their geological habitat, the microbiologists study the foundation on which all subsequent evolutionary events developed. This basic task has major consequences. First, during the age of the dominance of bacteria on earth, even before higher organisms appeared, 600 million years ago, the most important sites of minerals were formed. The standard example in this case is that of iron ores, such as those of the Kursk Magnetic Anomaly. Since we know the role played by bacteria, we can model under laboratory conditions the origin of minerals and rocks by

duplicating the physical-chemical conditions which no longer exist on earth. I believe that in the forthcoming decades substantial progress will be achieved in this direction. Second, here and there on earth, including in our country, in small areas the same microbial communities have been preserved, which were found in the Precambrian age and which, unquestionably, should be subject to environmental protection, for they could contribute a great deal to understanding the past of the earth. Microbial communities are easily damaged and greatly depend on the preservation of a hydrological and temperature regimen, for which reason they must be protected to the same extent as communities of higher organisms.

What was the key consequence of the development of the bacterial ecosystem? It was the formation of an oxygen atmosphere of a modern type. Such an atmosphere became a necessary prerequisite for subsequent evolution, for the reason that all superior organisms, including aerobic microorganisms, depend on oxygen. To what extent have bacteria preserved their influence on the atmosphere? Today's earth is covered with vegetation and quite highly organized, albeit microscopic, algae develop in adequate numbers in the oceans. Recent studies have indicated that the connection between bacteria and the structure of the atmosphere has not only been preserved but is of prime importance to the condition of the environment on a global scale.

The earth's climate is determined by its radiation balance which, in turn, depends on the so-called greenhouse components contained in the atmosphere: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous and nitric oxides, and ozone on the surface of the earth. Precise observations conducted in recent years have unquestionably determined the increased concentration of such gases in the atmosphere. The accumulation of carbon dioxide, caused, above all, by the increased combustion of mineral fossils and the inability of the ocean and the vegetation on the surface to absorb such a surplus of 5 gigatons of carbon every year, are subjects of particular concern. The inevitable consequence of such accumulation is a warming of the climate, with all deriving consequences and, above all, a large-scale restructuring of the economy. In assessing the possible ways of removing carbon dioxide from the earth's atmosphere, until recently attention was focused on increasing the ability of plants for photosynthesis, to compensate for the increased content of carbon dioxide. However, what was ignored was that carbon dioxide was formed in the breathing of micro-organisms in ground systems. The combination of processes, on the one hand, of photosynthesis and the decomposition of organic matter, on the other, the intensiveness of which depends on the season, leads to characteristic fluctuations in the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, reaching its minimum in the summer and its maximum in winter. Studies of the earth from outer space have indicated that forests and tundras in the northern hemisphere in the USSR, the United States and Canada, are

the sources of such fluctuation. Therefore, these countries influence the climate on earth both directly and indirectly.

Thus, the summer minimum in the concentration of carbon dioxide is explained by the photosynthesis in forests in the moderate zone and the winter maximum by the decomposition of organic matter. The role of animals in the release of carbon dioxide does not exceed 10 percent. All the rest is due to the decomposition of organic substances by soil microorganisms. It is believed that between 50 and 70 percent of vegetal residue is decomposed by fungi and the rest by bacteria.

Methane, the other greenhouse gas, is formed exclusively by bacteria which complete the decomposition of organic matter under anaerobic conditions. This occurs in moist and swampy soils. The maximal concentration of methane is found in the atmosphere of the northern hemisphere in moderate and high latitudes. In the past decade the content of this gas has been increasing by 1.2 percent annually.

Nitrous oxide as well is formed by bacteria only and is related to the condition of the soil and the nitrogen fertilizers applied to it. Nitrous oxide is slowly transferred into the stratosphere, where it reacts with ozone photochemically.

Therefore, recent studies have shown a strong connection between the activities of microorganisms and today's climate. On the one hand, the condition of microbial communities is determined by humidity, temperature and the season, and depends on the climate; on the other, however, it influences the climate by generating greenhouse gases. The forecast of climatic changes should take into consideration the conditions under which microorganisms function in the soil.

The atmosphere is the most important element of our environment, common to the entire globe, and is the clearest example in proving the global significance of microbiology. It is obvious, however, that studies which could lead to a reliable ecological prognosis should be based on the joint work of natural scientists working in different areas. Climatology, atmospheric chemistry and physics, meteorology, geography, plant physiology, soil studies, microbiology, energy and software systems are a partial list of disciplines the interaction among which is necessary in the study of global problems.

Today the necessary technical base for such work already exists, starting with aerospace monitoring and, if properly organized, society could justifiably rely on significant successes and a worthy contribution made by microbiology in their achievement.

Community of Microorganisms

The use of microbiology for global summations should rest on basic studies within the discipline itself. At the same time, a most important microbiological object such as the microbial community remains insufficiently understood. For a long time microbiologists focused on the exchange of matter in the microbial cell. This study was within the framework of microorganism biochemistry and physiology. It is possible only with a pure culture. However, it is precisely the community of microorganisms that is important in solving the problems we enumerated. In a microbial community bacteria are interconnected through the products of metabolism and, above all, the fact that the product generated by one organism is consumed by another, thus creating the complex food chain. The speed at which organisms grow is of great importance in the forming of communities, for it is precisely it that determines the sequential nature of development and the numerical strength of each individual type of organisms at a certain stage in the existence of the community. It is much more difficult to trace this in microbiology than, for example, in botany, for it is difficult to identify the individual microbial species in a natural material and simply impossible to identify dozens of species, as a geobotanist does. Such approaches are being developed currently, based on the study of nucleic acids and some proteins and, in all likelihood, will be advanced in the next few years.

The study of the community of microorganisms is by no means a worthless occupation. The point is that large-scale microbiological output is based precisely on the activities of such communities. An example is found in one of the most pressing global problems of the immediate future, that of fresh water. Already now mankind is feeling its scarcity due to the growth of industry, agricultural intensification and increased population. The natural treatment of water in nature begins with the activities of microorganisms which decompose polluted matter. Then they themselves are consumed by animals and, in the final account, streams and rivers are fed clean water, unfortunately only a few of them in some areas at present. The treatment of sewage waters is much more complex. Essentially, we must speak of the industrial-scale biological production of clean water. The volume of such output amounts to several billion tons annually. Currently very imperfect engineering computations are being made using the method of the "black box:" the activities of the microflora are summed up, and the empirical correlation between decomposition of polluted matter and temperature, the concentration of oxidizing substances and the density of the biomass are taken into consideration. The reliable control of such processes requires a deeper understanding of the interaction among organisms, for otherwise everything would be as though we tried to control a production process while familiar only with the raw material which is received by the plant and the end product, without any idea of the sequence with which such raw material is processed.

The biological treatment of water is, as a rule, power-intensive and expensive. However, it is possible to treat water with low-energy methods as well and, sometimes, even with a substantial generating of industry through the production of biogas. In order to design an efficient and stable system, we must know not only the products which form bacteria but also the kinetics of their growth, their complete development cycle and their ability to form granules or flakes and to cover solid surfaces. These characteristics have been ignored by the microbiologists although they are important to the technologists who, in turn, have been totally indifferent toward enzyme and metabolic processes. It is no secret that in our country biogas systems are being developed poorly and with difficulty. This is due not only to the inadequate pace of engineering experimentation but also the lack of profound understanding of the work of the microbial community.

By the start of the 1980s we had totally neglected anaerobic microorganisms, which develop in a total absence of oxygen, for interest was concentrated on the production of feed proteins based on non-edible raw materials, hydrocarbons above all. This is an essentially aerobic process, which consumes a great deal of oxygen. As it turned out, concentrating our efforts on the main, on the decisive area led to the fact that at a given point experience in work with anaerobes and our knowledge of such organisms became lost (this did not occur to such an extent in the West, where the development of anaerobic systems was based on rapidly growing knowledge of anaerobes and the ability to work with them). This lagging in basic science naturally affected its applied aspects. Clearly, the organizational lesson to be drawn from this story is that the concentration of forces and funds should not go beyond a certain limit and that a successful development calls for maintaining a wide front and variety of research. Naturally, this requires wisdom in guiding scientific research and showing concern not only for the present but also for the long-range development of society.

The strategy of the utilization of renewable resources is based above all on crop growing as a source of food, fibers and raw materials for the chemical industry. The intensification of crop growing is impossible without increased use of energy both directly, in the cultivation of the land, and transportation, as well as indirectly, through the production of fertilizers, toxic chemicals, etc. However, it is the status of the soil cover that is the foundation for broadening the base of renewable resources. It is important to emphasize that in turn this is determined not only by the cultivation of the land and overall energy outlays but also the activities of the microbial community in the soil, by the way we would be able to study, secure and optimize such activities. In this case the clearest are problems of retaining the humus and the nitrogen fixation. Since this topic cannot be discussed in detail in this article, let me merely point out its particular relevance and the role of microbiology in this range of problems which, unfortunately, has not been entirely realized so far.

Greater hope on the use of mathematical modeling should be placed in understanding the activities of communities of microorganisms. Unfortunately, today most such models are abstract, which confirms that they are in the stage of learning rather than of an efficient use of the method in the study and control of the processes occurring within the community. It is unquestionable, however, that it is precisely here that mathematical methods are the most promising. Despite the entire unreliability of forecasts, we can confidently claim that the use of mathematical methods in microbiology in the next decade should change the very nature of that science.

In our systematic line of considerations from general to specific features and from ecological systems to communities of microorganisms, the next step should be the study of the elements within the community—varieties and species of microorganisms. This is the base of general microbiology. Let me mention that each variety has specific essential features. If we estimate the number of bacterial varieties recognized by the international commission of microbiologists, the approximate pace in the study of the variety of the microbial world could be determined. By 1980 we were familiar with about 300 varieties; the pace of research over a period of 100 years had remained almost even: about three varieties annually. However, there was a literal explosion in the interest in the study of microorganisms between 1980 and 1985: in those 5 years 103 new varieties of bacteria were recognized. Only five of them were described by Soviet researchers. Obviously, these figures require an explanation. They convincingly prove the increased attention which scientists pay to the bacterial world abroad and the lagging in the pace of research in our own country in recent years. No such lagging had existed until the 1960s. A number of objective reasons could be given in explanation but the main one is the loss of interest in the subject and the pressure of the "physiological-biochemical" trend. The discovery of a new organism was considered a routine event in the scientific community. In recent decades work on the study of the variety in the microbial world was concentrated mainly in the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Microbiology, where a very small group of researchers were at work. They can be listed by name, and in our country there could be no more than some 20 first-rate specialists in this area.

Naturally, with such a small number of researchers it was impossible to acquire knowledge of all groups of organisms. The lagging behind the level of global research became quite drastic. The simplest illustration of this is the case of anaerobic organisms. A significant percentage of the 103 new varieties described in the world over the 5-year period (more than 40) were anaerobic bacteria and organisms developing under extreme conditions such as temperatures close to boiling. Anaerobes are very important in a number of respects. For example, in the human intestines, the correlation between strict anaerobes and organisms which can develop if they have

access to air, is 1,000 to 1. They play an equally important role in nature, where processes governing the formation of methane and hydrogen sulfide are entirely determined by specific groups of anaerobic bacteria. Nonetheless, very few specialists in our country are able to work with anaerobes. Not even basic equipment is produced for their use, such as special utensils, special resins, and boxes for work in an atmosphere of inert gas. I would not like to reduce the problem of the study of the variety of microorganisms to anaerobes, which precisely now has been intensively undertaken. The essence of the problem is that no one can predict what group of organisms will turn out to be important from the practical point of view 5 years from now, which is roughly the time needed for training a specialist. In my view, today we are short in this area of some 100 specialists on the level of senior scientific worker. Given the established pace of research throughout the world, the number of such specialists should be increased.

The description of a new variety of microorganisms takes a very highly skilled specialist as much as 2 years after the happy moment when he begins to suspect that he has hit upon something new. This time is needed for technical work, for usually the new microbes grow slowly and sometimes several weeks pass between siftings. It is also necessary to maintain "minimal standards" of description, which increases the significance of new molecular-biological methods, complex specialized equipment and cooperation with other specialists. The successful discovery of a new organism may occur several times in life and in this case the disparity between "aces" and associates lacking the necessary experience and the important qualities of a researcher is quite substantial. Such work cannot be done among other things but demands uninterrupted efforts. Skill and intuition play a primary role. That is why in frequent cases "microbe hunters" are strong individualists who study a single group of objects over long periods of time if not a life time. The death of any such specialist creates a "vacuum" difficult to fill.

Therefore, in order to enhance the level of microbiological research, the country must have a sufficient number of specialists in the various groups of microorganisms, despite the fact that at any given time some of them may be working on a seemingly irrelevant problem. However, this is only one aspect of the matter. The other is the preservation of the microbes.

The isolated microorganism must be preserved for subsequent work. This is accomplished through the so-called collections of microorganisms. Two world collections enjoy significant advantages over others; one of them is in the United States and the second in the FRG. The preservation of the type (the strain) is a necessary prerequisite for the acknowledgment of the existence of a new variety or species of bacteria. A collection of microorganisms has become the most important criterion of the possibility of independent development of microbiology in our country. In this case it is precisely the

physical preservation of the cultures that is important and the possibility of gaining fast access to it for work purposes. This is achieved by freezing the cultures.

The use of cryogenic equipment is necessary in the current activities of microbiologists, for otherwise it leads to a fast increase in the number of test tubes and the entire time is spent in trying to preserve the cultures or protect them from pollution. The CEMA members are currently engaged in the development of a common information system in order to know who and what researcher is "in charge" of one culture or another. Such a system, we believe, will require drawing extensive forces away from productive work. Naturally, it is very difficult to organize the preservation of a small collection of several dozen cultures with the use of contemporary methods. However, a stably functioning large collection of microorganisms is something we can accomplish. Its creation is a necessary condition for the development of microbiology and of the entire set of related scientific disciplines.

Therefore, the possibility of using microorganisms in promoting scientific and technical progress depends, above all, on two factors: the availability of cadres with the necessary work skills and the accessibility of standardized bacterial strains.

Scientific Work and Acceleration

It was not my purpose to formulate a work program for microbiology for the forthcoming decades, or else to provide a propagandist with most quotable figures and facts. My purpose was to use familiar examples borrowed from microbiology and to describe in this article the importance of the new factors in the life of a society which makes use of scientific achievements.

It would be naive to think that any scientific discipline is totally consistent with the requirements of its time. This would mean that the need for it is lacking and, consequently, that a stagnation exists in this scientific and technical area. The problem of microbiology, which we have considered by following the line of "global ecosystems-communities of microorganisms in high-volume production-variety of microorganisms" enabled us, I believe, to identify the characteristic features of contemporary natural sciences and some features of their organization.

This involves, above all, the interdisciplinary approach, which requires the training of scientific specialists on an entirely different basis than in the past. Today such a specialist must be receptive to the broadest possible range of problems. Consequently, we must facilitate interdisciplinary contacts and stimulate them in all possible ways. However, the structure of the Academy of Sciences was developed on the basis of circumstantial considerations which prevailed at the end of the 1950s. Thus, biological disciplines were divided into three departments: descriptive biology, with the Department

of General Biology; problems related to medicine, the Department of Physiology; all the "rest," which developed, Lysenko's views notwithstanding, was lumped together in the Department of Biochemistry, Biophysics, and Chemistry of Physiologically Active Compounds. As a result of such classification, a great variety of specialists were brought together, ranging from gene engineers to soil scientists. Under those circumstances, molecular biology achieved great successes. Meanwhile, however, ecology grew and developed throughout the world, in which biology is inseparable from the set of earth sciences. Efforts were made to solve interdisciplinary problems with the help of an increasing number of problem councils. However, deprived of finances and real power, in the majority of cases they only increased bureaucratic accountability. In other cases such councils simply duplicated the activities of scientific societies, which are interdepartmental organizations. I believe, and my opinion is shared by many of my colleagues, that a timely question is that of creating a Department of the Biosphere, which would be consistent with the contemporary level reached in ecological thinking and the problems which face society.

The next problem is that of "importing knowledge." Naturally, science is international. Specialists in different countries quickly find a common language when they come together on the basis of common problems, ranging from the survival of mankind in an ecologically unstable world to the systematization of unusual bacteria. Practical experience has indicated that scientists have been able to cooperate in areas which are very sensitive to emotions and confrontations, such as the ecological consequences of nuclear war. Therefore, such cooperation is possible in other areas as well.

The other side of the problem, however, is that of the scientific and technical autonomy of the country. Dependence on importing ideas and technologies becomes intolerable. The example of the study of the variety of bacteria proved how far we have fallen behind the drastically increased pace of this seemingly specific area. One of the reasons is failure to realize the practical usefulness of the extensive development of such work in solving specific economic problems. However, by the time that such problems have appeared, it is already too late: the development of the sector is doomed to the reproduction of results obtained abroad. In particular, in the study of the variety of microorganisms and the creation of a genetic stock, my view of the future, given the existing situation, is pessimistic. The reason lies not only in the insufficient number of microbiologists, which we mentioned. The gravity of the problem and the source of difficulties in domestic microbiology, in my view, lie also in the uniform training of specialists. In order to advance we must not only increase the number of cadres but their variety, dissimilarity of training, thinking, and skills and encouragement of successes. This demands extensive time and concern for preserving the originality of every specialist. Such a nonstandardized training is possible only with a close interaction between training

and research, between the VUZ and the scientific research institute. We must begin research work with the third year of studies, and the student must surpass his teacher in something, such as, for instance, a new understanding of related disciplines. Some progressive ideas in this area are included in the restructuring of the higher school, and I consider their fastest and fullest practical implementation a most important task.

The pace at which our microbiology is developing is inadequate. Its acceleration requires, above all, to eliminate time losses. Time losses occur at all stages of scientific activities. A scientific associate works slowly as though he has a century at his disposal rather than 10 years of active creative work, which decisively will define his status. This is the psychological legacy of the period of tranquillity, conservatism and compilations, and the aspiration to preserve the existing order of things. The growing bureaucratization of science and the possibility of controlling it by science officials who have neither the proper competence to judge matters in their essence nor the right to make constructive decisions, leads to unproductive time waste. The time for decision making must not be allowed to exceed the time for execution. Yes, an entirely unceremonious attitude toward the time and occupation of a scientific worker has developed in our country; it is spent by the institute's administration the way an administration of a production facility would never permit itself to act. Scientific work demands total involvement in the subject and a guarantee from distractions, as is the case with any type of creative work.

Exchange of information is slow: scientific articles are printed in our scientific journals from 1 to 2 years after they have been submitted. Above all, however, their purpose is not to inform the reader but to provide a possibility for self-expression by the "author." The promotion of a scientific worker depends on the number of publications, for which reason a mass of fragmentary communications is published without presenting an integral picture. The situation with books is even worse. Only a small percentage of them are works suitable for long-term use, such as manuals, guides and encyclopedias, the work on the compilation of which is poorly paid.

However, one of the main sources of time losses is the so-called planned procurement. Research involves a great deal of unpredictable elements. Frequently, in order to conduct an experiment and obtain a "yes" or "no" answer, a large number of a given reagent is necessary. It is impossible to obtain it quickly and legally, without resorting to the help of colleagues from other institutes. Many things cannot be planned for 1 year in advance. For that reason, on all levels supplies are being stockpiled and funds, frequently in foreign currency, are kept frozen. Acceleration in science is impossible without time saving, above all at each individual stage. Yet, with every passing day, such stages in

scientific work are becoming increasingly numerous and less and less time remains for the research itself, for it is absorbed by organizational measures, finding supplies and processing results.

Major problems, the solution of which is impossible without developed microbiology in the country, have become clearly delineated. Microbiology is the basis of biotechnology in the broadest possible meaning of the term, which is by no means covered by the examples and features presented here. Obviously, a generational change must take place both among researchers and science managers. Here as well we need a new generation with a new system of values, and a new style of thinking, consistent with the demands of our time and the high purpose of science in the life of our society.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

05003

Alliance Between Family Physician and Computer
18020005e Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17,
Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 77-80

[Article by Svyatoslav Nikolayevich Fedorov, general director of the Eye Microsurgery Intersectoral Scientific and Technical Complex, Hero of Socialist Labor, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences corresponding member, professor]

[Text] As a rule, the work of physicians throughout the world is still structured on the basis of principles which today mankind applies only to the arts—in the work of writers, painters, composers and sculptors. However, all of us perfectly realize that it is only books written by truly talented authors that should be read among the works of thousands of writers, and that the only paintings worth looking are those painted by truly gifted artists. In the same way, physicians, like artists, vary greatly. A patient may be lucky to come across a real talent in a physician. Alas, such luck is not all that frequent. In medicine, however, increasingly complex technologies are used in diagnosis and treatment and the choice of a physician today is becoming increasingly risky. In our medicine even such a risky choice has been reduced to a minimum, for a citizen can be treated only in his own sectorial polyclinic or hospital. Efforts to find a physician trusted by the patient, who has learned from his acquaintances, friends or from the press, that he is a good professional, involve tremendous difficulties. Patients have frequently been forced to change addresses for the sake of being treated by such a specialist.

Life has proved quite convincingly that the "one physician-one patient" system is becoming anachronistic.

What could and should be the alternative to this artisan principle which currently dominates world medicine? Obviously, only the principle of the organization of industrial production was able to bring it to a new level consistent with the technology of the end of the 20th century.

Reliability, high technical standards and a fast conversion to more advanced technologies and relatively low cost are all principles which, unquestionably, must be inherent in the medical "industry" as well. In this case a high degree of humaneness must remain its distinguishing feature.

In the past mankind was forced to convert to a production method in which an item is created not by a single individual but by a group of people. It is precisely with such a method, when the labor process is sometimes divided into several stages, that the mastery of complex technologies and the creation of electronic, space-rocket equipment, and so on, became possible. In cybernetics this principle is the base for the speed and reliability of computers, known as "paralleling the work." A direct connection exists between labor productivity and the degree of paralleling, to which the so-called continuing labor processes are particularly adaptable.

Any surgical operation is such a continuing process. For example, we cannot remove an appendix before slicing through the skin, stopping the hemorrhage, separating the muscles, etc. The paralleling of the work means including every subsequent participant in the labor process in quality control work. Accomplished by a single individual, this entails a tremendous risk, which could be compared to the struggle waged by a partisan detachment and operations of a regular armed force.

Nonetheless, in terms of medicine, the very word "industry" for the time being not only sounds strange but even frightening. The explanation to this is the great interest of every person in maintaining his state of health and, finally, saving his life and, therefore, his fear of abandoning treatment by a single physician, a method used for thousands of years. Throughout the entire history of medicine, its main organizational principle was the free individual agreement between the patient and the physician, according to which one of the parties entrusts his body to the physician, while the party of the second part agrees to engage in corresponding diagnostic treatment manipulations. In this case the physician must assume moral and legal responsibility for the quality of the treatment while the patient, in turn, should a positive result be achieved, must pay for the physicians' labor. This type of relationship has been kept virtually intact over the centuries. The only change has appeared in the past 200 to 100 years, in cases in which the work of the physician in a number of countries began to be paid by corresponding social agencies or hospital insurance. Naturally, the degree of responsibility of the physician to the patient for the result of the treatment in this case is

sharply reduced, for the physician becomes answerable to the medical bureaucratic system. In turn, this lowers his interest in learning new methods and improving himself as a specialist.

Someone may object that the results of the treatment of patients by the individual physician may be assessed better and his work paid more fairly under an administrative medical management system. However, an administrator becomes quite quickly disqualified, for he himself does not engage in treatment and, therefore, naturally, he cannot assess the work of a practicing physician. Control over the quality of treatment on the part of the patient, even under a paid health care system, is quite limited, for the patient could base such an assessment only on his own subjective feelings, which is by no means adequate.

Personal contact with the physician is, to the patient, a major psychological factor, in addition to the tradition of customized treatment. The word of the physician and his ability to cheer up the patient and to instill in him confidence in a favorable outcome are the start of the treatment. A patient who trusts his physician cannot imagine that the physician alone cannot secure the entire complex process involved in his treatment and follow the entire technological chain. To the patient the personality of the physician is essential. Nor should we ignore a peculiar "deification" of the physician by the patient. Medicine has always garbed its working methods in secrecy and has tried, to this day, not to raise the curtain of the holy of holies to the uninitiated. Given its shortcomings and the impossibility to cure every patient and, in frequent cases, to make a proper diagnosis, medicine needs to operate in an atmosphere of some secrecy. Such an atmosphere makes the work of the physician easier, for it makes it simpler to explain his errors or lack of efficient treatment methods for the time being, both to the patient and to his family.

It was problems of human psychology that were among the main reasons for the fact that today's medicine in using the old methods of treatment surrounded by a certain secrecy, explaining little of its essence to the population. The treatment technology itself, even for most common diseases, is not explained. Everything is usually reduced to a recommendation to go to a physician should any radio listeners or television viewers ask a question. Naturally, if society, which means the people themselves, does not "issue topics" on possibilities for updating this technology, it would not receive the information it needs. Nor is it excluded that the basis of the unwillingness of the people to be maximally informed about their psychology, disease mechanisms and treatment methods, is a deeply seated fear of death. Yet medicine is in contact with death every day and every hour. The human complex is that it is better not to know, better not to remember and not to think.

What must we do so that everyone of us could notice on time the beginning of an illness and find a good physician, so that an accurate diagnosis may be made and a

proper treatment method chosen and, should surgical intervention become necessary, to have the guarantee that the surgeon and his assistants are highly skilled, that instruments and equipment are of high quality and that anesthesia is safe and painless? How to reach this point?

We believe that the only way is to have a home or, more accurately put, a family physician in charge of one's health. However, this would be a modern physician, relying on the powerful potential of the latest equipment, technology and scientific achievements.

Every Soviet person must have the right to have a defender of his health and that of his children and elderly parents. How many such physicians do we need in our country? A simple computation indicates that 600,000 would suffice, so that there would be 450 people, i.e., approximately 120-130 families per physician. Is it realistic to have such a number of physicians? Unquestionably, it is. Can a single physician watch over the health of 450 people? Such a physician could easily visit four to five families daily, examine everyone, and make his entries in the family health record. It is thus that in the course of the year a physician could visit a family five or six times. Naturally, the people should have the right to choose their family physician. The more families the physician has in his charge and the better the patients feel, the higher should be the physician's salary (which, in our view, should be sufficiently high). A physician must assume responsibility, including economic responsibility, for the health of the people who have entrusted it to him.

Should the family physician be unable to make an accurate diagnosis, he should have the possibility to turn to the diagnostic center. The setting up of such centers for the various areas of medicine is quite urgent. This would include a cardiovascular, urological, stomach-intestinal, and other centers. In these centers all the necessary equipment for diagnosing possible disturbances in one system or another of our organism should be concentrated. If a family physician would direct his patients to such a center, it is assumed that he will have the possibility closely to cooperate with the diagnostic center and to discuss the diagnosis. He would have the right to select any diagnostic center he trusts and which, in his opinion, would provide a high-quality diagnosis.

Instead of the more than 40,000 polyclinics which have been set up today in the country, it would suffice to organize 10,000-15,000 such centers. They would require 100,000 to 150,000 physicians. Their labor should be paid on the basis of the number of patients they have examined and also be sufficiently high. Naturally, diagnostic errors would affect their salaries.

In a number of areas diagnostic centers could apply the conveyor belt system which sharply increases the labor productivity of physicians and the quality of the diagnosis.

After receiving from the respective center all the necessary data, the family physician should determine the treatment of his patient. Naturally, in this case he could consult with the diagnostic physicians. If the patient cannot be treated at home, the family physician should have the possibility of directing him to a center for intensive pharmacological treatment or reconstructive surgery, mandatorily specialized. If surgery is necessary, it would be important for the family physician to be able to go to the proper center together with the patient and comprehensively to discuss the surgical procedure.

We believe that reconstruction centers could be set up on the basis of the "Eye Microsurgery" or "Osteosynthesis" MNTK and guarantee high quality and top standards of treatment. In order to eliminate monopoly, it would be expedient to have for each different type of surgery no less than two MNTK with their branches. This will create a competitive atmosphere and guarantee a high technological standard. Two MNTK would suffice for relatively narrow specializations, such as ophthalmology or otolaryngology, while several may be needed for other areas. No more than 150,000 to 200,000 physicians would be required to staff the surgical reconstruction centers and intensive therapy centers. However, in this case the financial investments in such a health care structure would be the highest (compared with the other two systems), for has fallen most severely behind global technological standards. In our view, however, such expenditures are necessary.

Unquestionably, it would be impossible to restructure our health care system in a couple of years. Obviously, 10 to 15 years would be required for a conversion to such a three-step system. The conversion, however, should be initiated as of now.

I have already published in the press similar suggestions. I would not say that they have not been supported. However, time goes on, and is important for them to become reality. It would be quite inefficient to waste money this 5-year period on multiple specialized hospitals, which will become unnecessary in the future.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

Lenin. Genoa. New Diplomacy

18020005f Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 81-91

[Article by Savva Artyemyevich Dangulov, writer, editor in chief of the journal SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA]

[Text] On 26 October (8 November) 1917, the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets adopted the historical Decree on Peace, which was drafted by V.I. Lenin, the first legislative act of the new socialist state. The decree laid the main foundations of the Leninist policy of

peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. On the next day an agency was set up to handle Soviet foreign policy—the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. A diplomacy of essentially new, socialist-type was initiated.

Everything related to the personality of Lenin and the victory of the October Revolution and the establishment of our socialist state is infinitely precious to the Soviet people. The activities of Vladimir Ilich in the crucial periods of domestic and world history are of particularly great interest. One such period, unquestionably, is that of the Genoa conference, which brought the young Soviet diplomacy its first success.

I had the pleasant opportunity of retracing the steps of the Genoa conference. One of the people who helped me to resurrect in my memory the event of the spring of 1922, which took place in the Ligurian capital, was the famous Serbandini (his guerrilla pseudonym was Bini), a member of parliament, brigade commissar during World War II, head of the Genoa branch of the Italy-USSR Society, a poet and historian. In parting, Bini gave me a priceless gift: a set of Italian newspapers, including the provincial press, of the period of the conference.

"However strange this writing may appear, it displays the Genoa battle. The core of the event was Chicherin and his contact with the West. I said Chicherin, but one must read Lenin. There was Vladimir Ilich's formula concerning the two systems of ownership and coexistence. This meant a search for a common language. No problem can be more vital...."

One can only be amazed at the accuracy of the statement by my Italian friend: "Lenin....search for a common language...."

In my view, it would be extremely beneficial to trace the manner in which, in the course of the live practical application of Leninist diplomacy, the foreign policy principles of the Soviet state were shaped, historically referred to as the policy of peaceful coexistence. Without claiming to provide an exhaustive study of this process, I would like to define its main landmarks on the basis of some relatively unknown data, at which point the writer's vision has an advantage.

In order to imagine most accurately the atmosphere in which we took the path to Genoa and the natural development of events themselves, let us turn to some of those events which took place 7 decades ago, soon after the victory of the October Revolution.

The record book kept by Vladimir Ilich's secretaries includes a number of names. Lenin loved to talk with foreign visitors, challenge them to debates, and furiously argue with them in defending the truth of the October Revolution. This was a period of change and a great deal was in the process of development. In this connection, life was the main feature in any argument.

Vladimir Ilich's interlocutors included people of different political affiliations. The world of businessmen played a particular role. I am referring, in particular, to a series of meetings between him and the American Raymond Robins, which lasted through the winter and the almost entire spring of 1918. These meetings become all the more important when correlated to the personality of Robins himself and, naturally, the nature of their talks.

Who was Robins? As a wealthy person he, as at that time was frequently the case in America, had been hastily given a colonelship and assigned to Russia as representing the Red Cross. In the summer of 1917 he was given permission to visit the front. It may be assumed that the information obtained by Robins on the condition of the army and his evaluations gained him the trust of the U.S. embassy in Petrograd and, in particular, that of Ambassador Frances. In any case, when the October Revolution broke out and it became necessary for the Americans to establish contacts with the new government without recognizing it, it was precisely Robins who was sent to Smolnyy.

As a person with many connections and accomplishments, he asked Lenin for an audience. He was received by Vladimir Ilich who, judging by available information, knew of him. A meeting took place which, based on data at our disposal, involved a free discussion which did not exclude religion, for Robins considered himself a believer and always carried a Bible in the pocket of his service jacket. However, economic problems were not excluded and, on each occasion they assumed increasing importance in the talks. The main idea was that the two great powers could engage in mutual trade to the benefit of both nations. Something else was important as well: Lenin's interlocutor had started his career the hard way, as a miner. According to Robins' biographers, it was luck that had helped him to become rich.... It is difficult today to determine the number of visits which Robins paid to Lenin. According to available information, there were no less than 16-17 such meetings, which made a certain impression on the American guest, something which concerned Frances greatly. The cables which the ambassador sent to the Department of State (they have been published) reveal his growing mistrust of Robins.

However, as the meetings continued, the main topic was that of future economic relations between the two countries and, in this connection the question of mutual profit. Here is an interesting detail: differences in state and ownership systems, as they said at that time, bothered neither side. With the advent of spring their discussion on economic problems assumed such priority that they decided to formulate a plan for economic relations between the two countries, a plan which Robins promised to present to the American President back in the United States. His departure was scheduled for May and, as one may assume, this may have been influenced by the wish of the ambassador. Essentially, the idea was the following: in the autumn of 1917 Robins would be

assigned a special mission to Smolnyy, a mission which the ambassador considered one of intelligence. As early as the spring of 1918, Frances no longer trusted his colleague.

The draft plan for economic relations between the Soviet Republic and the United States was completed by mid-May 1918, and Robins took it across the ocean. Warned by his ambassador in Petrograd, however, President Wilson did not receive Robins. This becomes understandable when compared with subsequent events. While Lenin and Robins were seeking a way for future economic contacts, Wilson was formulating his plan for intervention. Nonetheless, the plan for a business and mutually profitable economic cooperation between Soviet Russia and the United States actually existed. In that sense we can claim that the importance of Genoa was revealed as early as May 1918.

The first mention of that city was made in diplomatic circles at the beginning of 1922.

What kind of period was that? Essentially, the Soviet Republic had resumed its programmatic concept on the development of economic relations with foreign countries the moment the first signs of the defeat of the intervention appeared. I repeat: the first signs.

"I am frequently asked whether the Americans, not the workers only but, mainly the bourgeois, who have a negative attitude toward war with Russia are right when they expect of us, should a peace treaty be signed, not only the resumption of trade relations but also the possibility of obtaining certain concessions in Russia," Lenin said on 23 September 1919. "I repeat that they are right. Given sensible conditions, it would be desirable for us as well to grant concessions, as one of the means of attracting technical aid from countries more advanced in that respect, for the duration of the coexistence of socialist with capitalist countries, side by side" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 197).

This idea played a role in the propaganda of the foreign policy principles of the Soviet state. It was precisely the idea of concessions which proved that, given the good will of the West, there would be obstacles to its implementation. However limited the precedence in this case may have been, it nonetheless existed. Vladimir Ilich warmly supported the idea of concessions when suggested by Armand Hammer, the American entrepreneur. The first time Lenin met with Hammer was after the American had returned from the Urals, where he had studied asbestos deposits. They talked in Vladimir Ilich's office in the Kremlin. The third person present was Ludvig Martens, who was the representative of the land of the soviets to the United States after the revolution. The topic of the conversation was quite delicate: under what circumstances would Hammer sign a lease for the development asbestos deposits. Martens insisted on the involvement of substantial funds, generally accepted in

such transactions. Hammer, as a businessman, bargained, explaining his insistence by saying that he was merely a representative of the company and had no right to settle the matter himself. Naturally, Vladimir Ilich was aware of the fact that the truth was on Martens' side. Nonetheless, he kept the discussion going cautiously. As one may guess, the deal was not all that big and a concession would not threaten us with any significant losses. The political effect of such a contract, however, promised a great deal of benefits. It would be the first concession granted!

We know how closely Lenin followed the implementation of this contract. "You have my best wishes for the full success of your first concession," he wrote Hammer. "This success will be of great importance also in trade relations between our republic and the United States" (op cit., vol 54, p 252).

To the Soviet Republic, as we pointed out, the contract with Hammer was of great importance: the country was preparing for major foreign policy actions, based on the desire to develop, on a strategic scale, economic contacts with the outside world. Let us repeat that we are dealing with the time which immediately preceded Genoa.

Thus, the Genoa ship was becoming visible, slowly but increasingly, emerging out of the fog of the years, a fog which obstinately refused to disperse. In other words, having defended the gains of the October Revolution and defeated the forces of international imperialism and the domestic counterrevolution, the land of the soviets was given an opportunity to assert the principles of the policy which had been favored by Lenin 4 years previously in his talks with Robins, a policy of coexistence and mutually profitable economic cooperation among countries belonging to different social systems. "Unlike imperialism, which is trying to stop the course of history by force and bring back the past, socialism has never on its own will linked its future to military solutions of international problems," the CPSU Central Committee political report to the 27th Party Congress emphasized. "This was confirmed by the very first major debate which developed in our party after the victory of the Great October. In the course of it, as we know, the views of the 'left-wing communists' and Trotskyites, who defended the theory of a 'revolutionary war,' which, allegedly, could spread socialism in other countries as well, were firmly rejected."

Let me now express a thought which, possibly, will not be shared by everyone. However, this is my opinion and, I believe, I have the right to express it. Let us begin with a reference to a fact. In going through Reed's files at Harvard University, Soviet critic A. Startsev established that the first time the name of Georgiy Vasilyevich Chicherin was mentioned as a people's commissar of foreign affairs was by Lenin during that thunderous October night of 1917. Naturally, Vladimir Ilich knew that Chicherin was not in Russia at that time, and that he was sitting behind the thick walls of London's Brixton

jail. Nonetheless, he named him. Why? Was it because Chicherin was a comprehensively educated person and, in the broadest possible meaning of the term, a polyglot? Not likely. Even without Chicherin, there were more than enough educated people in Vladimir Ilich's entourage. The point, it seems to me, was different: inspired by the great joy of the victory, Lenin was able to see both the strong and weak aspects of our revolution. As a perspicacious and sober politician, able to resist the influence of moods at all turns of history, he realized that the October Revolution had won but, for the time being, this was only a single October Revolution. He knew that the fate of the Russian Revolution greatly depended on how we would get along with the rest of the world ruled by capitalism, and how we would achieve a degree of reciprocal understanding with it, which is what we needed.... Lenin assumed that this could be achieved by Chicherin better than by anyone else. This was not only because of Chicherin's linguistic abilities and inordinate knowledge of foreign policy, but also because of other qualities he possessed: a profound knowledge of the very structure of life of that world and its customs and traditions. Not least was also his origin, which had never been considered by the revolution a quality but which, in this case, could also become one!....

From Lenin's remarks on the margins of book he was reading at that time we can trace the way the idea of the famous Genoa declaration, which was made public by Chicherin in the spring of 1922, was ripening in the mind of the leader. The book was "Russia in the Fog," by Herbert Wells. As we know, Wells had come to Russia toward the end of the summer of 1920 and spent some time in Petrograd, where he had been the guest of his friend M. Gorkiy, in his famous apartment on the Kronverkskiy. Wells then went to Moscow where he met with Vladimir Ilich on 6 October. At that time the Englishman's essays had already been published in THE SUNDAY EXPRESS. Judging by what we know, however, Lenin had been unfamiliar with them until they had been assembled and published in a separate booklet. Wells' letter to Gorkiy, to whom, possibly, a copy of the book was sent, included the friendly inscription: "With greetings to the great, precious and unforgettable Russia."

Lenin read Wells' book, on the margins of which he made extremely interesting notes, the spirit of which essentially anticipates the theses included in the Genoa declaration. But let us first speak of Wells' attitude toward the land of the soviets, which is important in understanding what will follow. I would like to point out two aspects. First, Wells' sympathetic references to Lenin and the Soviet government: "I would name among leaders with creative capabilities people such as Lenin himself, who has grown amazingly since his foreign exile..." (Vladimir Ilich underlined the last six words which he may have found amusing). Wells described the Soviet government as "the most inexperienced government in the contemporary world," adding that "essentially, however, it is an honest one." It is in direct

connection with this that we should understand Wells' statement expressing his attitude toward Marx's theory and its practical implementation in the land of the soviets: "Even had Marx never existed, there would have been Marxists...."

The most important feature in the works of the British writer and in Lenin's notes, however, lies elsewhere. The spirit of that which should be described as the concept of Wells' book is manifested in his basic idea to which he turns repeatedly and which, on each such occasion, has been noted by Vladimir Ilich. Wells saw in Russia, in its tremendous reserve, both human and natural, a possibility of accumulating power without which mankind could not do if it had faith in its future. According to Wells, as Lenin emphasized, "The doom of civilization in Russia and its degeneracy...would block for Europe for many years any access to the wealth of the Russian soil.... It is most likely that a catastrophe would not be contained within it. A huge gap would open in civilization, which would threaten to absorb, one after another, vast contiguous territories to the east and the west. It would not be excluded that it would absorb all contemporary civilization."

Wells saw many possibilities for business cooperation between the new Russia and the West. He was clearly in favor of such cooperation, aware of how much it could contribute to the contemporary world, including to the solution of the vital problems which had appeared as a result of the devastation caused by the war. It was the latter, as just about the most important thing, which was emphasized by Wells and noted by Vladimir Ilich: in speaking of the future of economic contacts between the land of the soviets and the West, the English writer described the United States as "the only country" in the capitalist world which, in his view, could play a decisive role in this case.

Lenin's remarks on Wells' books are a unique document, in the full meaning of the term. Vladimir Ilich made those notes for his own use, which make them reflect even better his feelings during those memorable days. The fact that the notes covered a wide range of problems, in particular those pertaining to contacts between the young Soviet state and the capitalist West, makes them particularly valuable. One way or another, this strange document makes it easier to enter the world of Genoa.

In inviting the Soviet government to participate in the conference, the Western powers insisted that Lenin head the delegation to Genoa. In accepting the invitation, however, the Soviet government immediately stipulated that if the chairman of the Sovnarkom would be unable to attend the conference personally, the composition of the delegation and its prerogatives would be the same as they would be with his participation.

In January 1922, having accepted Lenin as chairing the RSFSR delegation to the Genoa conference, the exceptional session of the All-Russian Executive Committee

appointed Chicherin as his deputy, "with all the rights of the chairman, should circumstances exclude the possibility of comrade Lenin's presence at the conference." In the several months which followed, Vladimir Ilich continued actively to participate in drafting the corresponding documents, studying literally all details related to preparations for the conference and, subsequently, directing the entire work of the Soviet delegation in Genoa. In particular, the thesis of Chicherin's speech presented in San-Giorgio Palace, was drafted by Ilich. This is the way the Genoa event developed, and it was Lenin who steered all complex matters related to it.

Anticipating, let me say that during my stay in Italy I met with Senator Umberto Terracini. I had an interesting discussion with this person who had visited Moscow repeatedly, had met with Vladimir Ilich and, to the best of my knowledge, had felt the power of Lenin's arguments. At the time that I was talking with Terracini, he had already spent 17 years in jail; during the war he had been a partisan in the Piedmont, which had aged him substantially.

"I know," Terracini said, "that people of tremendous intellect, such as Vorovskiy, with whom I had the honor of meeting repeatedly, were the backbone of the Soviet delegation to Genoa. However, behind every delegate there stood Lenin. This could be easily detected judging by the strategic moves of the delegation. Lenin was the strategist of the revolution and strategy means foresight, considerations.... Such is my view of Genoa."

At this point it would make sense to bring back to mind the main features of Vladimir Ilich's participation in the preparations for Genoa. It was precisely during the time that he was making his notes on the margins of Wells' books that Lenin wrote one of his first truly expanded speeches, in which he made an effort to survey and study our economic relations with the outside world, based on the fact that "the familiar, although highly unstable but, nonetheless, existing balance has been created in international relations" (op cit., vol 44, p 291). What makes this statement even more meaningful is the fact that in that same report presented at the Ninth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Lenin said, referring to the capitalist world: "They call us criminals but nonetheless help us. It turns out that they are economically linked with us. It turns out, as I already told you, that our estimates prove, on a broad scale, to be more accurate than theirs. ... There is a force which is greater than the desire, will and resolution of any one of the governments or classes hostile to us: the force of common economic universal relations, which makes them to take this path of relations with us" (Ibid., pp 303, 304-305).

Subsequently (February 1922) in documents issued for our delegation, Vladimir Ilich drew up a precise list of questions to be borne in mind. In his view, every member of the delegation must especially prepare himself to deal in particular detail, and thoroughly with one

of the most important diplomatic and financial problems. We can only admire the thoroughness with which the problems studied by Lenin and set to the delegates were: he named the books they must be thoroughly familiar with, such as Keynes' "Economic Consequences of Peace," the works of Lansing, and others. Pay particular importance to our position and its possible alternatives, depending on the behavior of the other side. Vladimir Ilich emphasized that the sum total of speeches and declarations made by our delegates at the conference must be such that, whatever the course and outcome of the conference, "the result would be a short but clear presentation of the totality of communist views...." (Ibid., p 375). We cannot fail to note how with each separate document the corresponding directives became increasingly fuller. It is impossible to include within a single article the huge amount of materials which developed in drafting the directives. However, it was precisely at that stage of the preparations that the following formula emerged: reach and agreement with the pacifist segment of the other (bourgeois) camp. "One of our main, if not the main political task in Genoa is to separate that wing of the bourgeois camp from the rest of the camp.... And to consider, from our viewpoint, both admissible and desirable an agreement with it, not only on trade but on politics as well... (Ibid., p 407).

Displaying that extreme precision inherent in him, even when it was a question of most complex matters, Vladimir Ilich clearly defined the tasks of our delegation in a speech at a meeting of the communist faction of the All-Russian Congress of Metal Workers, on 6 March 1922: "We have been saying, from the very beginning, that we welcome Genoa and will go to it; we have been perfectly aware of and never concealed the fact that we are attending it as merchants, for to us trade with the capitalist countries...is absolutely necessary and that we are going there in order to discuss most precisely and most advantageously the politically adequate conditions for such trade, and that is all. We perfectly realize the foundations for this game: we know that its essence is trade. **The bourgeois countries must trade with Russia....**" (op cit., vol 45, pp 2-3).

And so, the delegation was preparing for its trip to Genoa. Lenin instructed and advised it how to behave: "...We, communists, do not share the views of pacifists. This is quite well-known from the reading of communist publications. However, going there as merchants, we unquestionably deem it our duty comprehensively to support any effort at the peaceful solution of disputes" (Ibid., p 63).

In recalling the days which preceded Genoa, Georgiy Vasilyevich said that Lenin, whose poor state of health forced him to live in the countryside, nonetheless actively participated in preparations for the conference. "Although in the winter of 1921/22 Vladimir Ilich had lived in the countryside for a long time, he was intensely interested in problems related to the Genoa conference. He wrote a number of notes on the subject and the

general content of our addresses in Genoa was based on his personal notes. His was the idea of linking the solution of the question of debts to giving us loans. Prior to our departure to Genoa, when we discussed the text of our speech at the opening of the conference and when expository statements were being suggested, in the spirit of our previous statements, Vladimir Ilich wrote something like "no frightening words should be used."

And so, Genoa. Chicherin's speech in San-Giorgio Palace, in Genoa, was to be the first and it was precisely this speech that Vladimir Ilich discussed with our delegates prior to their departure.

I shall not conceal the fact that I was very excited as I entered San-Giorgio Palace. I followed the marble staircase, a truly palatial one, to the second floor. A few more steps and I was in the conference hall. It seemed to me that I was standing on that very spot on the floor where once the desk of our delegation stood. There was no podium, and Chicherin delivered his famous speech from where he stood.

Georgiy Vasilyevich spoke about peaceful economic cooperation between the two systems of ownership—socialist and capitalist; about the equality of both systems of ownership; about a universal reduction in armaments by all countries (it was at that point that the Soviet side drew world public attention to this problem); and about convening a world peace congress.

The speech by people's commissar Chicherin contained a prediction which is striking to this day. In defending and promoting the Leninist principles of socialist foreign policy, which were based on the first decree of the Soviet Republic—the Decree on Peace—it was as though he was looking into the future of Soviet diplomacy, defining many of the problems which it would have to deal with, such as the problem of peaceful coexistence, which has been relevant for decades, that of disarmament, the solution of which plays a central role to this day, and the problem of creating a universal organization which could rally the efforts of peace-loving people, which is to a certain extent a prototype for the United Nations.

Look into the text of the declaration made by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, on 15 January 1986: is this not what the Soviet leader is saying under the new historical conditions: "The new and decisive actions currently taken by the Soviet Union in the defense of peace and for the sake of improving the entire international situation are an expression of the flesh and the spirit of our domestic and foreign policy, their organic combination. This is the fundamental historical law emphasized by Vladimir Ilich Lenin."

The famous statement delivered by the Soviet Republic in Genoa, which included Lenin's theses, was the flesh and the spirit of our domestic and foreign policy. The echo which it triggered throughout the world (correspondents representing the press of all continents, which was

a rarity until then, had been accredited to the conference), alarmed the delegates of the Entente to such an extent that they tried to end the practice of plenary meetings and hold discussions behind closed doors.

One such place was a palace owned by the rich d'Albertis family in Genoa. I visited that palace. My guide was Carla d'Albertis, the owner of the palace and an eyewitness to the events of that distant spring of 1922. I do not recall if this noble Italian woman helped me to determine the nature of events which took place under her roof. However, to give her her due, she clearly depicted the acting characters in the confrontation, Lloyd George and Chicherin in particular, proving her story by opening the guest book and showing the handwritten autographs of both. The rest may not have been necessary, but Mrs d'Albertis could not be stopped. She took me to the dining room, which was perfect in form and proportions and it was in the envious spaciousness of this dining room that the main battle of the conference was fought, which determined the position of the parties on the main problem: the debts....

And so, we are now very close to what could be described as the epicenter of the Genoa duel. The Entente put the question point-blank: repayment of the old debts. Soviet Russia refuses to pay the West, insisting that it was repaid with the losses which were the result of the intervention and blockade organized by the imperialist power. Litvinov named a figure of the estimated damage, which triggered a dull rumbling in this palace on a Genoa hill: 39 billion gold rubles. In addition to this amount, there was also a damage which could not be assessed precisely but with the addition of which, the sum of the Soviet counterclaim was no less than 50 billion gold rubles.

The head of the British delegation took the floor. His speech indicated that he, Lloyd George, could not even conceive of the sum quoted by the Russians. All of this was so meaningless, he said, that a by no means rhetorical question appears: Why was it necessary to meet in Genoa at all? The Russians said: "Intervention." This frightening word, however, has no meaning. This was not an intervention but only help to forces which opposed the Russians....

Chicherin expressed his readiness to answer the British prime minister on the basis of the principles of international law, sanctified by age-old practices. It was precisely the Entente, in his words, that had given strength to this movement which raised its hand against the Russian Revolution. We remember the statement of the allies, dated 4 June 1918, which unequivocally said that detachments of White Czechs, for instance, should be considered as the armed forces of the Entente itself. Turning to the treaty between the Entente and Kolchak and Vrangel, it is easy to see that these treaties were of the same nature. In short, a government which has sent its forces on the territory of a foreign country is responsible for their actions. It was absolutely elementary that

the government should compensate for the damages caused by such forces. This rule had not been invented by us. It is a principle of international law. Incidentally, looking at the history of England, Chicherin went on to say, one can easily recall that the British have more frequently honored than rejected this principle. It is a known fact that they were forced to acknowledge the amount of damages caused by the actions of the British cruiser "Alabama" [sic] during the U.S. Civil War and pay for such damages in full. Naturally, in this case the scale is different but the principle is the same. As to what is owed Russia, it should be acknowledged that its losses were incomparably greater than those of the Entente. In the course of the war the Russians accounted for more than one-half of the total losses of the Entente. A fact which cannot be ignored is that the Russian counterclaim substantially exceeds the amount of its debt.

While Chicherin spoke, Lloyd George was assembling his own arguments. He noticeably shifted the system of arguments, saying that private individuals have the right to file claims for losses and have the right to compensation, in which case the law is on their side. Chicherin, however, used arguments which were difficult to refute. The implication was the following: private lenders frequently act jointly with their own governments and should assume responsibility: that same Urquhart was helping Kolchak. Lloyd George considered that the parties had defined their positions quite precisely and suggested a brief recess. Standing up, Chicherin noted: "There are fewer of us, for which reason we shall leave."

The Soviet delegates followed Georgiy Vasilyevich out of the palace's dining room. They too needed to discuss what had turned into the topic of the dialogue, and the shady garden paths in the palace were as suitable for this as the magnificent dining room of Mrs d'Albertis. The brief exchanges among the delegates led to the understanding that the Entente would reject the Russians' suggestions which, incidentally, is what happened. Lloyd George sent a messenger to summon our delegates back to the palace. The British prime minister read the statement by the allies, which could be reduced to a single word: "No." He delivered the text as an ultimatum.

This clearly revealed a purely tactical maneuver on the part of the allies and the hope that a categorical "no" would force the Russians who, as the Entente assumed, would find themselves isolated, to make concessions. However, our quiver had some spare arrows. On the way to Genoa the Soviet delegation had stopped in Berlin. The sole purpose of the talks, which had taken place there in the strictest possible secrecy, was the possibility of concluding a separate treaty between Soviet Russia and Germany, should the situation in Genoa provide the necessary motivation for this. It could be assumed that the question was to be solved less by the Germans than the Russians. Would the Entente allow such a turn of events? Did the allies suspect such a "threat?" This was

not excluded. However, on Easter Sunday, almost immediately after the breakfast attended by some of the delegates in Genoa, Lloyd George found out that the previous evening the Russians and the Germans had signed a treaty on establishing extensive contacts, which allowed the Russians to break the ring of political and economic blockade and he virtually fainted....

Lenin in Genoa? Yes, it was precisely thus that the question was formulated: Lenin in Genoa! As we know, Vladimir Ilich was not there but the strategy and, to a certain extent, the tactics of the Genoa battle, were entirely his. The originality of the brilliant Leninist plan was that after making the statement on the two systems of ownership which was essentially a policy of coexistence, our delegation implemented the principle of this declaration by signing the Rapallo treaty. It was precisely this treaty, signed by socialist Russia and capitalist Germany in Rapallo, that proved to the entire world how essential and effective was the idea of economic and political contacts between the two worlds under the complex circumstances of the 20th century.

How did Lenin himself rate the Rapallo agreement? The draft resolution of the VTsIK on the report submitted by the delegation to the Genoa conference, he drafted, includes the following: "...the VTsIK welcomes the Rapallo treaty as the only proper solution to the difficulties, chaos and threats of war...and considers only this type of treaty normal in relations between the RSFSR and the capitalist states..." (op cit., vol 45, p 193).

Like all great Leninist plans, this idea included a great deal of foresight. The thoughts of our great leader were directed toward the formulation of the only possible efficient policy which can preserve the peace today.

Our ideological opponents, who consider Genoa one of the greatest defeats of capitalist diplomacy, are trying to cast aspersions on the principles proclaimed by the Soviet delegation at the conference. Aware of the fact that the policy of the two systems of ownership, the policy of coexistence, asserts the goodwill of the revolution, Western propaganda had formulated its own system of arguments aimed at refuting the Soviet proofs. It would be worthwhile to consider them.

First argument: our opponents claim that the land of the soviets was allegedly forced to resort to the principles of coexistence, for expectations of a global revolution had failed. Is it not clear, however, that Lenin had initiated a series of talks with Robins, which had ended with a formulation of a plan for the development of Soviet-American economic relations virtually the day after the October Revolution, which unequivocally proves what was guiding the Soviet system at its birth? It is also worthwhile to recall that all the parameters of Lenin's concept concerning uneven social developments at the respective stage of capitalism, the fact that not all countries will simultaneously convert to socialism and

that the revolution can win initially in a single separate country, which will live surrounded by capitalist countries, presumes precisely coexistence.

Second argument: the enemies of socialism claim that the policy of coexistence itself is, allegedly, nothing but a means for gaining a "breathing spell" and, in the final account, is aimed at "preparations for war." This claim makes no sense. The history of the adoption of a policy of coexistence by the Soviet Union convincingly proves that that policy proceeded from the very way of life of the Soviet Republic during the very first years of the revolution, based on the sum total of the constructive tasks which faced a society building socialism. Even during the period of foreign intervention the Soviet government had spoken out in favor of coexistence and cooperation, economic agreements with America and "peaceful cohabitation" by all nations (see V.I. Lenin, op cit., vol 39, p 209; vol 40, p 145).

The third argument lets us go back to the very essence of the topic of our discussion: Genoa, the Rapallo treaty. Our Western opponents consider that the purpose of the Rapallo treaty was less to protect the economic interests of the land of the soviets than to undermine the economic power of the Entente, using totally disloyal methods. Is it worth mentioning that this type of argument as well cannot withstand criticism? To the contrary, the Rapallo treaty was an example of how we conceive, as Vladimir Ilich said, the "idea of true equality between the two systems of ownership..." (op cit., vol 45, p 193). In speaking of that treaty, he emphasized that such equality "can be found exclusively in the Rapallo treaty" (Ibid).

Here is a detail which, in my view, is noteworthy: the Americans with whom Lenin had his first business talks considered the behavior of the head of the Soviet government as profoundly moral. It is precisely this circumstance, I am convinced, that shaped, despite differences in the social nature of the country they represented, a very grateful attitude toward the Soviet side and Lenin. Everything related to Armand Hammer is public knowledge. But then there was Raymond Robins.... Robins died in the mid 1950s, having retained for the rest of his life the deepest possible respect for Lenin. My private files include a document which was given to me as a gift by Lucita Williams, the widow of the American journalist Albert Riece Williams, the great friend of our country and associate of John Reed. It is a private letter written by Robins to Williams. Robins' opening sentence explains everything. Here it is: "Dear comrade in the Great Soviet Revolution in Petrograd of November 1917!" And then: "...My interest in Soviet Russia remains unchanged. Those of us who witnessed this great initiative, which was born of the very flames of the revolution, understood, albeit partially perhaps, the meaning of freedom and light of which Lenin dreamed." Is there anywhere else another document which would confirm so clearly the loyalty which an American business person felt for the principles of trust and friendship with Lenin's country?

Leaving Genoa, I once again visited San-Giorgio Palace, together with Bini. Again, as in the past, I went to the conference hall. Time had entirely swept off anything which could remind us of the spring of 1922. But in my mind as, probably, in that of Bini, one could hear the living voice of Chicherin delivering his famous speech. This and nothing else could explain what my Italian friend said:

"Anything can be suppressed but not words addressed at the future...."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

05003

Big Changes

18020005g Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17,
Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 92-101

[Article by Vladilen Georgiyevich Burov, leading scientific associate, the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] **The 13th CPC Congress consolidated and developed the line of the further restructuring of all areas of life in the Chinese society. The following notes by a scientist-philosopher, who went on a scientific assignment to the PRC, described the nature of the changes taking place in that country.**

Returning to a previously visited country, one unwittingly notices the changes which have taken place in it. At the same time, one looks for what is known as historical sites and is not subject to the changes of time, and to revisit familiar places. Such were my feelings when I found myself back in China after a rather lengthy absence of 26 years. Naturally, "by virtue of my office" I was familiar with the events in that country and had written about it. However, as the saying goes, better to see once than to hear about it a hundred times. A great deal of change had taken place in everything: the architectural neatness of the cities and the appearance of the people, the principles which governed the functioning of the society and economic management, the way of life of the population, the political system, the social status of the intelligentsia, the educational system and moral values.

The numerous changes are all the direct result of the broad reforms in town and country, related to the search of a Chinese way to socialism or, as they say in China, to "socialism with a Chinese face." I recall a talk on this subject at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and another on the ideas of Mao Zedong at the PRC Academy of Social Sciences (after 1978 all that remained within the system of the Academy of Sciences were natural science institutes, while the humanities were brought together within a different organization—the Academy of Social Sciences. There is an All-China

Academy of Social Sciences and similar academies may be found in all provinces, autonomous regions and three cities—Beijing, Shanghai and Tientsin). The talk was held with Deputy Director Du Xiao (a Moscow State University graduate), Li Yuanli, Li Chengjun, Han Jia-cheng and others. In their view, the idea of "socialism with a Chinese face" is not always accurately perceived and an occasional opinion is voiced that this is allegedly an abandonment of the principles of socialism in general. Possibly, this explains the fact that in China they would rather speak more about the specifics than the general laws governing the building of socialism, for in the past year, as was the case in other countries, the specific conditions governing the application of general principles were not taken sufficiently into consideration. However, my Chinese colleagues believe that these principles remain inviolable. There are four of them: the leadership of society by the Communist Party, the leading role of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the ideas of Mao Zedong, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism.

The CPC does not refuse in the least to study the experience of other socialist countries. However, it proceeds from the fact that one cannot duplicate it mechanically. In speaking of the specific features of their country, the Chinese scientists usually point out the following: the large size of the population; the terrible backwardness which prevailed before the revolution, manifested in the prevalence of pre-capitalist relations; the preservation, to this day, of vestiges of feudalism in the way of life and in the social consciousness; and the errors of the "cultural revolution." All of this demanded of the Communist Party a study of the lessons of the past and the adoption of new approaches to economic and political problems. In the area of economics there is a rejection of the administrative methods of management or their use to the detriment of economic methods. Currently the popular term is "socialist commodity economy" which, in practical terms, means the comprehensive development of commodity-monetary relations and controlling economic processes through the market. The distribution system is being perfected and equalization has been replaced with the slogan of "from the prosperity of some of the populations to the prosperity of all." In the words of Deng Xiaoping, the objective to be reached by the end of the 20th century is "Xiaokang" (small prosperity), according to which the per capita GNP will be between 800 and 1,000 U.S. dollars per year (it is currently \$400). By the end of the 21st century, according to this plan, China should come close to the present level of the highly developed countries in the world in terms of this indicator.

The participants in the talk emphasized that an economic reform is inconceivable without a political one. In the past there was in fact no democracy in the country and without democracy within society there can be no economic modernization. The following changes have already been made in the political system: the holding of positions for life in the party and the state has been

abandoned; the cult of the personality of Mao Zedong has been condemned and collective leadership has been introduced; unnecessary centralization of management has been rejected; the rights of local authorities and the prerogatives of the All-China National Assembly have been increased; the party is being "separated" from the state; the legal rights of the citizens are being secured or, as Du Xiao said, a process of developing a juridical, a legal system is taking place in the country. At the end of our talk, she said that Chinese society is at the initial stage in building socialism. For the time being there is no full concept of "socialism with a Chinese face" but there is a search for ways and means consistent with the real conditions for building socialism.

During the talk the question of "the ideas of Mao Zedong" was repeatedly touched upon. Most of the discussion on this topic involves Xu Jinxing, head of the department of the ideas of Mao Zedong at the philosophy department of Beijing University (such departments may be found in other universities as well). What came out of the discussions with him and other specialists is that today the "ideas of Mao Zedong" are considered, first of all, as "a combination of the general concept of Marxism-Leninism with the specific practices of the Chinese revolution;" second, as the embodiment of the party's collective wisdom, as the views expressed not only by Mao Zedong but also by Liu Shaoqi, Chou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping, Chen Yong and other leaders. As to their views on Mao Zedong himself, as my Chinese colleagues noted, a specific historical approach is necessary. In addition to the obvious merits in preparing for and making the revolution, he also made major errors (guideline stipulations on this account are found in the resolutions of the Sixth CPC Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation (June 1981). In the words of Xu Jinxing, it is necessary to make a distinction between the "ideas of Mao Zedong" as such and the errors committed by Mao Zedong in the last period of his life. His views on building socialism contain both accurate ideas as well as dogmatic petit-bourgeois concepts. The merit of Deng Xiaoping, Xu Jinxing emphasized, is that he criticized the cult of Mao Zedong and the superstitions related to the veneration of his personality.

The new situation in the country triggered new problems which require theoretical interpretation. In recent years Chinese social scientists have developed a serious interest in the study of the social nature of the new contradictions which appear in the course of the economic reform and the ways and means of solving them. An entire trend of research has developed—the "dialectics of socialism;" articles and books are being published, scientific conferences and symposia are being held and special courses are being offered on this subject in the universities. Kwangtung is one of the centers for scientific research in this area. A small group of researchers, headed by Professor Zhang Jiangming (in the past a high party official and today head of the province's philosophical society) published three collections of articles on the dialectics of the socialist society between 1984

and 1986. The same problem is also being studied by associates at the Institute of History of Marxist Philosophy at Sun Yatsen University, Liu Rong, Gao Qiyong and other Kwangchou philosophers. On their initiative, three all-China conferences have been held since 1983 to discuss topical problems of the development of socialist society in China at the contemporary stage. Talks with Zhang Jiangming, Liu Rong and Gao Qiyong gave me an idea of the views of the Chinese scientists on the problem of "the dialectics of socialism." Most of them believe that antagonistic contradictions are not general and that one could speak of them only in terms of the enemies of socialism. Contradictions related to the existence of state capitalism, mixed enterprises, including those which use foreign capital, individual entrepreneurial activities and the adoption of the course of "one state—two systems" are nonantagonistic. In describing private entrepreneurial activities, Liu Rong and Gao Qiyong emphasized the need for such activities in contemporary Chinese society: they helped to develop the economy and to enhance the living standard of the working people. According to them, the opinion among Chinese scientists is that one should not equate hired labor under capitalist and under socialist conditions. In the latter case the person has the right to choose whether to offer or not his services as a hired worker. Furthermore, he has the right to change jobs and, finally, the state can limit the number of hired workers and restrict methods of activities of private enterprises. The entrepreneur is not an exploiter if he personally participates in the production process. In a certain sense, an exchange takes place here: one person has money and the other one has manpower. The entrepreneur earns profits from investing his capital in precisely the same way that an investor earns interest on funds deposited in a bank. Not everyone shares this viewpoint and many scientists believe that whenever the number of hired workers exceeds a certain level, hired labor assumes the nature of exploitation.

A striking interest is shown in China by people of all ages in books and journals. State, cooperative and private bookstores are crowded. The selection is quite wide: serious philosophical treatises and mass entertainment, political publications and manuals on traditional Chinese calisthenics, translated scientific and technical works, a variety of reference publications, and world literary classics, including works by modern Western writers. The book by A. Toffler, the American futurologist, "The Third Wave" (published here in 1.5 million copies) stands next to a psychological work by the contemporary Chinese writer Zhang Xiangliang "A Woman Is One-Half of the Man," the novel by A. Troya on Catherine the Great, Freud's "Interpretation of Dreams," P. Kropotkin's autobiography and the classical Chinese novel "Dream in a Red Tower."

In 1985 China assumed a leading position in the world in the total publication of books: a total of 6 billion copies were printed. The windows of stores exhibit dozens of journals on problems of sports, the arts, fashion, recreation and literature. Some of them are specialized, for

young people and women and, of late, legal journals and newspapers for the mass readers have become popular and are published in virtually all provinces (along with periodicals on problems of economics and management). Virtually all scientific research institutes or VUZs have their own publication and, sometimes, even several. For example, the Institute of Philosophy of the PRC Academy of Social Sciences has six journals. Currently, there are more than 4,000 journals published in the country.

In 1985 works were published without official sanction, promoting pornography, violence, murder and feudal superstitions. The authorities had to pass a special resolution to block the production of such "literature." Another trend was noted as well: in pursuit of profit, some publishing houses began to forget the publication of socially significant works, preferring to concentrate on entertainment.

The resolutions of the Third to the Sixth CPC Central Committee Plenums, 11th Convocation, made major changes in the spiritual atmosphere in Chinese society. They openly spoke of the tragic errors of the past and the "cultural revolution." The time has now come to sum up some results and to draw historical lessons.

Members of the scientific and creative intelligentsia, who enjoy today high social prestige in China (in one of his speeches Deng Xiaoping described the intelligentsia as part of the working class), openly discuss what is preventing the country from moving ahead. The fate of socialism in China, the humanistic nature of Marxism, the forms of political leadership of the masses, the reasons for the appearance of the cult of personality, assessments of Mao Zedong's political and theoretical activities, relations between managers and the masses, the characteristic features of socialist democracy, the correlation between science and ideology, the role of the intelligentsia in society, freedom of scientific and artistic creativity, the nature of socialist spiritual civilization and the place of cultural traditions in the process of the country's modernization, and other problems are topics of lively discussions in party intellectual circles and among scientists and young people. A variety of frequently mutually exclusive views are expressed. There is a clear aspiration to surmount previous stagnation of theoretical thinking, dogmatism and quotation-mongering.

In recent years Chinese social scientists have been granted wide access to information from abroad. Suffice it to say that the Institute of Philosophy of the PRC Academy of Social Sciences subscribes to some 300 foreign periodicals (no less than 70 of them Soviet); the philosophy department at Beijing University subscribes to some 50. Every single philosophy department in China (there are more than 30) subscribe to the Soviet journal *VOPROSY FILOSOFII*.

The "open policy" toward the outside world has led not only to the appearance of foreign goods but also of views of different conceptual orientation. As the Chinese now say, foul air could come along with clean air if a small window is widely open. In this connection, the resolution passed at the Sixth Plenum of the CPC Central Committee, 12th Convocation (September 1986) "Resolution on the Leading Course in Building a Socialist Spiritual Culture" notes that "deep changes are taking place in the spiritual condition of the people and we are facing a major historical test: shall we be able truly to oppose nefarious bourgeois and feudal ideology, and avoid any threat of abandoning the right way. Difficult and lengthy work lies ahead to surmount in all areas of social life the harmful influence of a corrupt ideology and morality."

At present it is as though the slogan of "Let One Hundred Flowers Bloom and Let One Hundred Schools Compete" seems to be having a revival. In talking with Chinese social scientists, we frequently hear them say: "We are looking," "We are searching." Increasingly the free and creative discussion of topical problems of building socialism, Marxist philosophy and socialist political economy are entering scientific life. A large number of conferences, symposia and meetings are held at which a variety of viewpoints are expressed. The favoring of this approach is based on the sad experience of the past, when the ideological struggle was being waged by administrative methods, combined with the loud repetition of trite truths. The best means of struggle against alien views, my interlocutors said, is the creative development of Marxism and the daring solution of new problems.

In this connection, I remember a winter evening in an unheated room in a district hotel in Central China (south of Yangzi houses and local hotels, with the exception of modern ones, are usually not heated). My interlocutor was a young, 35-year-old doctor of philosophy (at the start of the 1980s a new system for training scientists and VUZ teachers, somewhat similar to the Western model, was introduced. Today there are two types of post-graduate studies: candidate and doctoral. They take 3 years each. The first 3 lead to a master's degree. With that degree students have the right to undertake their doctoral studies. This explains the appearance of young doctors of sciences in recent years in the social sciences). He had come simply for a discussion with a Soviet philosopher. We discussed problems of the creative approach to Marxist theory which is precisely what interested my interlocutor as it had many other Chinese social scientists I met. They are not satisfied with the basic truths found in books on philosophy and the alienation of such books from life and from the real problems of socialist reality. In our country, my interlocutor said, there is a great deal of dogmatism among philosophers and we frequently cling to obsolete concepts. You can open any textbook on philosophy and you are bound to see there the concept of its creative nature. However, we are quite reluctant to "insult" the classics, and to say that some of their ideas "no longer work" today (the way I understood it, it was not a question of

revising the fundamental principles of Marxist philosophy). The conversion of Marxist philosophy into a set of eternal postulates applicable in all cases of life, the Chinese philosopher went on to say, turns young people away from it. Today many students are unwilling to attend lectures on philosophy and competition for enrolling in philosophy departments is considerably behind competition for enrollment in schools of economics or law. Later, I frequently heard statements on the major problems of Marxist philosophy and on its dogmatizing.

I was interested in finding out about the new trends in contemporary Chinese philosophy. The development of Marxist philosophy through the enrichment of its apparatus of categories, mastering the achievements of contemporary natural sciences, proper assessment of Western philosophy and its rational aspects and the scientific inventory-taking of domestic philosophical legacy are by no means the complete list of problems discussed in Chinese philosophy publications.

The question of reforming the "system of Marxist philosophy" as a study topic has been raised in connection with the need to restructure the teaching of this subject in VUZs and the drafting of new textbooks. There is no standard philosophy textbook. There are more than a dozen of them but the most popular are only five or six. The structure of the textbooks is similar to the one used in corresponding Soviet editions. However, many Chinese philosophers are not satisfied with the traditional separation of the material into two parts: dialectical materialism and historical materialism. Experimental textbooks are being written which are new above all in terms of their structure. This approach was pioneered by a group of scientists from Jiling University, rallied around the dean of the philosophy department, Professor Gao Qinghai. In explaining his approach, this noted Chinese philosopher wrote: "The structure of philosophy textbooks used in our country is essentially borrowed from Soviet textbooks. It was gradually shaped and established in the period after the October Revolution in the Soviet Union.... It reflects essentially the level of knowledge of Marxist philosophy of the people belonging to the 1930-1950 generation. Time is progressing quickly and the content of Marxist philosophy is steadily enriched. Correspondingly, the level of understanding and knowledge of Marxist philosophy must be increased as well. History is unfamiliar with the existence of an eternal fixed theoretical system.

The group headed by Professor Gao Qinghai worked for several years on a new textbook written as a research project. It does not contain the traditional separation between dialectical and historical materialism. Problems of Marxist philosophy are considered through the lens of subject-object relations. The first part of the textbook (it is a two-part work) came out toward the end of 1985; the second was published in the summer of 1987. It must be pointed out that the approach taken by the Jiling scientist is not approved by many Chinese philosophers, and,

as though responding to his opponents, Gao Qinghai excitedly said that the division of Marxist philosophy into dialectical and historical materialism is inconsistent with V.I. Lenin's concepts: the question of the correlation between life and consciousness cannot be considered from two viewpoints: initially from the positions of dialectical materialism and then from those of historical materialism. According to the Jiling philosopher, problems of the theory of knowledge must not be separated from the practice of building socialism. It is erroneous to speak of dialectics without mentioning the materialistic understanding of history, for in this case it would be difficult to separate Marxist philosophy from the views of Hegel and Feuebach. One could sense that Professor Gao Qinghai was greatly concerned with the condition of the science of philosophy in the country and the standard of scientific research. According to him, existing philosophy textbooks suffer from a major shortcoming: the explanation they provide to many questions is inconsistent with the true meaning of the concepts expressed by Marx, Engels and Lenin. In this connection, he particularly emphasized the role of Lenin's "Philosophy Notebooks" in the development of Marxist dialectics. In the course of our talk, Professor Gao Qinghai repeatedly took up the question of the need for the creative development of Marxist philosophy in the light of the new problems raised by the scientific and technical revolution, the practice of building socialism and the advance of knowledge. The very spirit of Marxist philosophy requires the steady intensification of its concept, for which every philosopher is responsible.

Today Chinese scientific and artistic intellectual circles highly value writers and scientists who display a free, an "open" style of thinking. Usually, if they wish to praise any given scientist or to underscore the creative nature of his concepts, they say: "He thinks freely." One such scientist among philosophers is Li Zehou, member of the Institute of Philosophy of the PRC Academy of Social Sciences. A widely educated person with a brilliant literary style and uncommon ideas, author of books on problems of aesthetics, the history of Chinese philosophy and the teachings of Kant, he is popular among scientific and creative youth but by no means do all of his colleagues share his views. I spoke with him twice. Our discussion dealt primarily with a topic popular among Chinese social scientists: the dialogue between Western and Chinese culture. Philosophical and cultural comparisons are currently experiencing a kind of boom in China. The need for socialist modernization has unavoidably raised a large number of questions which require serious theoretical interpretation, such as what are the characteristics of traditional Chinese culture, and could its elements be used in renovating the country; are there common features between the two cultures and, in particular, in terms of the way of life, behavioral standards, mental stereotypes and the structure of the personality or else are they divided by an unbridgeable gap; finally, what is the place of Chinese culture in human civilization? The range of views on all such problems is quite broad. Some scientists, mainly among the young,

have adopted a negative attitude toward all traditional culture, finding in it no positive elements whatsoever. They have called for the "total Europeanization" of China. The opposing viewpoint is one of ideological modernization based on a "new Confucianism," which is a blend of the positive values of Confucianism with the achievements of Western science. It is claimed in this case that the tempestuous economic progress achieved in recent years in Japan, Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea is allegedly related to their application of Confucianism in social life. A third view is held by Li Zehou who favors a synthesis of Western with Chinese philosophies but based on the "Western doctrine," with the Chinese one as a supplement. In terms of the nature of the problems discussed, the present debates remind us of the ideological disputes of the 1910s and the 1920s, the period of the movement for a "new culture," with the essential difference that they are now based on the sociohistorical experience of the past decades and the contemporary stage in the development of Chinese society.

Interest in the study of domestic philosophy and culture of the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, when an interaction, a dialogue between Chinese and Western philosophy developed, has sharply increased in connection with the question of a cultural dialogue. Currently the views of a number of noted non-Marxist ideologues are being reassessed. I was able to meet with two of them: the oldest Chinese philosophers Professors Feng Youlang and Liang Shuming. Both of them are past 90. I was pleased at the opportunity to visit with Liang Shuming. To read his works and write about them is one thing and to meet in person a man who born in 1893 and who was at the origins of modern Chinese philosophy, another. In the 1920s he was a supporter of traditional Chinese culture, Confucianism in particular, emphasizing the superiority of Eastern over Western civilization; at that time Liang Shuming's political views sharply differed from those of the Communist Party. In the 1940s, although remaining an idealist, he supported the course charted by the CPC for national reconciliation: after the victory of the people's revolution he did not leave China, unlike many other men of culture (incidentally, he was among the guests invited to the recently held 13th CPC Congress). I expected to see a decrepit and physically and mentally weak old man. I was welcomed by a thin, small but physically still fit oldster. Our conversation took 2 hours. We discussed Confucianism and Buddhism. I was the first Soviet philosopher ever to visit him. Smiling, Liang Shuming said that in the 1950s, when he was already past 60, he started to study the Russian language but was unable to master it. In parting, Liang Shuming presented me with his book published in 1984, his first in the past 35 years. It deals with the interrelationship between the human psyche and morality and includes references to I.P. Pavlov's theory.

Extensive studies are being made in China on the history of Marxist philosophy and a work on this topic in eight volumes is being prepared. I met repeatedly with its

editor in chief, Professor Huang Nansheng, who until recently was dean of the department of philosophy, Beijing University (Chinese VUZs and scientific research institutes have introduced age limitations for holders of administrative positions).

An amazingly modest and charming man who has had a difficult life, he enjoys great respect among Chinese philosophers, including those who do not share his views. Huang Nansheng has actively promoted the study of V.I. Lenin's philosophical legacy. He is the author of the very popular work "Philosophical Notebooks" and Dialectics." It is thanks to the efforts of Huang Nansheng and his colleagues Zhuang Fuling, Cheng Zhishang, Yi Zexiong, Wang Dong and others that an entire trend has been developed in Chinese philosophy on Leninist dialectics. Huang Nansheng emphasizes the importance of the proper depiction of the history of global Marxist thinking and the process of its development in its entire complexity and contradictoriness. One should not deny, he says, the contribution of a given philosopher to the development and dissemination of Marxist doctrine because of his later theoretical errors or erroneous political actions. Nonetheless, we must point out that the study of the history of Chinese Marxist philosophy in China remains weak.

I remember my meeting also with Professor Wang Yinting of Wuhan University, who is one of the greatest experts in China on G.V. Plekhanov's works. I saw in his office the works of the great Marxist theoretician in the Chinese and Russian languages (the professor is fluent in Russian and has participated in the translation of these works into Chinese). He closely follows foreign studies on this topic and has a complete bibliography of Soviet works on the subject. When I jokingly said that he could not possibly have the recently published book "Podснежник" [Snowdrop] (the first fictionalized work on G.V. Plekhanov), which is part of the series on "Ardent Revolutionaries," and was written by V.D. Osipov, Wang Yinting immediately pulled out of shelf a xeroxed copy of the novel. I had to give up. This Chinese scientist is literally enamored of G.V. Plekhanov's personality; a study he has written on the works of the Russian Marxist, after many years of work, will be published soon. In it the author expresses his disagreement with some Soviet scientists who, in his view, have rated insufficiently highly the historical role which G.V. Plekhanov played in the development of Marxism. It became clear, subsequently, that he was referring to assessments made in the mid 1950s, when Soviet science had only begun to surmount the simplistic approach to the works of that scientist and political figure.

During my 10-month stay in China I had the opportunity to talk with many Chinese philosophers: noted professors and young post-graduate students, deans of philosophy departments and beginning teachers. All of them showed an interest in the situation with Soviet philosophy, its new trends and new developments in philosophical works. China's philosophical public is familiar with

Soviet philosophy. Some 60 books and several hundred articles by Soviet authors have been translated from 1978 to 1987. The books and articles given an idea of the standards of Soviet philosophical science although in some cases, in my view, occasionally works without merit are selected for translation (thus, a book on the philosophical problems of the natural sciences, which came out as early as 1961 and even then was of no particular scientific value, was recently translated).

We must point out that knowledge of Russian and familiarity with contemporary Soviet philosophy are by no means a rarity among Chinese philosophers, particular specialists in Soviet philosophy. Some of them are graduates of Soviet universities. Others learned Russian in China in the 1950s and 1960s; others again, young people, have undertaken the study of Soviet philosophy relatively recently. In my discussions with them I found out that they were well informed with the nature of some of the debates taking place among Soviet philosophers and with the views of one scientist or another. Their interest in Soviet philosophy is not only "academic" but also practical. For example, Wang Dong, a young instructor at Beijing university, was right when he wrote that "the comprehensive study of the experience of Soviet philosophers, with all its pluses and minuses, will contribute to the development of Marxist philosophy and the building of socialism with a Chinese face."

The book "Contemporary Philosophy in the USSR (1945-1982)," edited by Professor Jia Zeling, appeared in China's bookstores in the summer of 1986. The book provides an essentially accurate idea on the trends of development of Soviet philosophical science in recent decades. Nonetheless, in my view, it does not reflect all new features in the works of Soviet philosophers.

As a whole, interest in the Soviet Union may be noticed in various Chinese social circles. Students, teachers and scientists, with whom I met most frequently, asked a variety of questions dealing with the nature and depth of the economic reform, changes in cadre policy, organization of scientific research, structure of scientific establishments, nature and depth of debates conducted by social scientists, the living standards of the Soviet people, the reasons for the scarcity of some food products, the low quality of consumer goods, the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism, the value orientations of Soviet youth and its attitude toward the ideals of communism and many others. For example, a student audience at Xiangtan University (about 600 people) was greatly interested in the way Soviet students study, live and relax and whether they were permitted to marry (marriage is not recommended in Chinese VUZs). They wanted to know how truthful to life is the situation as depicted in the motion picture "Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears," which was enthusiastically welcomed in China.

Frequent contacts with scientific and student youth enabled me to identify its most essential features. The Chinese student, post-graduate student or young scientific associate of the mid-1980s is industrious. He is very

interested in knowledge, reads a great deal, learns foreign languages (primarily English) and is independent in his judgments. His cultural standard is frequently higher than that of his teacher, whose lectures he may be attending, or of his senior colleagues, for although aged between 20 and 25, he is familiar with the works of authors, whose names were banned or given a pejorative reference for many years. Of late sociopolitical readings are frequently sponsored in Chinese universities. I attended one of them at the university in Beijing. For 2.5 hours 1,500 undergraduates, graduate students and young teachers closely listened to two papers on "Max Weber and Contemporary Society." Although one of the speakers was, to put it mildly, not a particularly gifted orator, the people remained in their seats and virtually no one left, for no such paper had been previously presented.

Naturally, the students and young scientists are not involved exclusively in studies and science. Discotheques have become widespread. There are vocal and instrumental ensembles and there is a liking for entertainment music, foreign essentially. Freedom of thought and openness in discussions among young people are paralleled by a certain freedom in the style of behavior and clothing. It is interesting to communicate with such young people, for they have their own views on all problems. This particularly applies to the young scientist. A feeling of personal dignity, ability to defend their views and respect for the opinions of their interlocutors are characteristic features of many of them. Nonetheless, one is frequently amazed by their ignorance of what is taking place in the neighboring country, the Soviet Union. Years of reciprocal isolation and alienation have left their mark. Today Chinese youth is better informed about life in Western countries but even in that case its ideas are by no means accurate. To those who have visited the United States, in frequent cases America is conceived of only in terms of Harvard or Princeton.

There are a number of indications that interest in our country is growing in Chinese society and will continue to grow, particularly in connection with our initiated restructuring. Invariably, audiences or in the course of private conversations the discussion will turn to the latest events in our country, to what restructuring should give and is giving Soviet society and, finally, the attitude within the people and the party toward M.S. Gorbachev's reforms. (I am using the Chinese expression). In learning about the changes occurring in our country and about the present stage in the development of Soviet society, my Chinese colleagues frequently said: "We have the same problems and that is not amazing at all, for both of us are building socialism."

While in China, the idea came to me to share with the Soviet people my impressions on what I saw and heard there. Learning about it, my Chinese acquaintances, as a rule, said one thing: "Write the truth, such as it is." I hope that my notes are a truthful, although a rather incomplete, presentation of some aspects of life in today's China.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

05003

From One Earth to An Integral World

18020005h Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 17,
Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 102-105

[Review of the book "Our Common Future. The World
Commission on Environment and Development."
Oxford University Press, New York, 1987, 383 pp]

[Text] "Our Common Future," is the title of the work produced after almost 4 years of work by the World Commission on Environment and Development, which was set up under the aegis of the United Nations. This report formulates suggestions on long-term ecological strategy aimed at achieving the stable development of mankind for the period until the year 2,000 and beyond it. The report was submitted to the UN General Assembly for its consideration.

The commission members included representatives of 21 European, Asian, African and North and South American countries. Its members included ministers of foreign affairs, noted personalities in the areas planning and finances, people who formulate strategy for the development of agriculture, science and technology, and noted scientists. The commission was headed by G. Brundtland, the leader of the Norwegian Labor Party and Norway's prime minister. The Soviet Union was represented by Academician V.Ye. Sokolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Evolutionary Morphology and Animal Ecology.

This international commission was an independent agency which worked in close contact with the national governments and the United Nations but not under their control.

In 1982, when the question of the status of this new agency was being discussed, it was suggested that its competence be limited only to "ecological problems." According to Brundtland, such a narrowing of the problem would have been a grave error: "The environment does not exist separately from human actions, ambitions and needs, and efforts to isolate it from human problems was what brought to life the very expression of 'environment,' which is interpreted in some political circles in the sense of 'primitive.' The concept of 'development' was narrowed and reduced merely to the question of 'how can poor countries get richer.' Hence the automatic conclusion that it was the duty of the specialists to help the developing countries. However, the 'environment' is where all of us live and development is what all of us do in an effort to improve our lives. One is inseparable from the other."

The commission held a number of public hearings on the study of such problems in a number of countries, including in Moscow in December 1986. As its work and concluding documents indicate, the processes which are occurring on the planet objectively lead to the spreading and assertion of a new way of thinking, the main principles of which have been proclaimed in recent Soviet foreign policy documents. The new thinking, the development of which is actively favored by the Soviet Union, is making its way in all areas of the globe. The impetus provided by the 27th CPSU Congress and its idea on the interdependence of the world are meeting with the understanding of the international public and many governments, for they are consistent with their own thoughts, expectations and aspirations.

Following is a presentation of the introductory part of the report, which gives an idea on the nature of the activities of the international commission and the conclusions it reached.

"In the mid-20th century," the report reads, "for the first time we were able to see our planet from outer space. ...Perhaps this had a greater impact on our thoughts than the revolution caused by Copernicus in the 16th century, when he staggered mankind with the discovery that the earth was not the center of the universe. From outer space we can see a small and fragile little sphere dominated not by the creations of human hands but by the structure of clouds, oceans, vegetation and the soil. The inability of man to 'fit' his activities within these structures radically changes planetary systems. Many of these changes are paralleled by life-threatening catastrophes. This is a new objective reality which we must acknowledge and accept."

Fortunately, the advent of this new reality coincided with positive processes new to our century. Today we can transmit information around the earth faster than ever before, produce more food and goods with fewer resources and science can provide people, potentially at least, with the possibility of gaining a better understanding of natural systems. The earth can be seen and studied from outer space as an organism the health of which depends on the health of all of its parts. It is within the power of mankind to achieve tremendous successes by coordinating its activities with the laws of nature. Such cultural and spiritual legacy strengthens the hope of the earth's population that its economic interests will be met and that it will survive.

The commission expressed its confidence that the people can build a more secure, just and safe future. The report indicated the possibility of the advent of a new age of economic growth which must mandatorily be based on strategies which will call for the conservation and multiplication of natural resources. Its authors are convinced that this growth will be the main way to eliminate the terrible and increasing poverty in the overwhelming part of the developing world.

These hopes, however, the commission believes, will be justified if decisive joint political action is taken, which should immediately put the use of environmental resources under control in order to ensure mankind's stable progress and its survival. The political leaders, specialists and scientists who took part in drafting the report do not forecast the future. Their task is different: persistently to warn, based on the latest accurate scientific studies, that the time has come to solve the problem of providing adequate resources for the present and future generations. The commission does not submit a detailed plan of action but merely indicates the way through which the peoples of the world could expand the area of their cooperation.

Mankind has many encouraging accomplishments: infant mortality is declining; the life span is increasing; the share of the world's population that can read is increasing and so is the percentage of children going to school; the global production of commodities is outstripping population growth.

However, the other side of the present type of development includes trends which are no longer tolerable in terms of the planet and its inhabitants. Such negative processes are traditionally classified into "development" costs and the cost of controlling the "environment." As far as the problem of development is concerned, as the commission notes, in terms of absolute figures, today there are more hungry people in the world than ever before and their numbers are growing. The same applies to people who are illiterate, and to those who lack good water and good housing. The gap between rich and poor countries is widening instead of narrowing and there is little hope that with the existing trends and global institutional structures this process could be prevented.

Processes fraught with radical deformations of the face of the planet and threatening the life of many of its species, including man, are also taking place in the environment.

The government of the different countries and international organizations are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that it is impossible to separate the problems of economic growth from those of the environment; many forms of development destroy the natural resources which nurture them and the degradation of the habitat could undermine economic progress. Poverty is the main reason and the main consequence of the global problems of the environment. That is why it is inconceivable to try to solve such problems without adopting a truly broad approach which would encompass the factors which create the existence of poverty and international inequality in the world.

"After our discussions and surveys, conducted in the course of public hearings on five continents, all members of the commission realized the need to concentrate on a central problem: many contemporary development trends, which are making an increasingly wider range of

people poor and unprotected, are also triggering the increased degradation of the environment. How can such a development process continue in the next century, when the population of the earth will double while the possibilities of nature will remain the same? The realization of this contradiction has made us to look at development itself from a broader viewpoint. We tried to evaluate it by going beyond the narrow framework of simply improving the economic situation of the developing countries, and reached the conclusion that a new approach is necessary through which the progress of mankind would be maintained not only in individual areas and for a limited time but throughout the earth and on a long-range basis. Therefore, stable development becomes the objective not only of developing but also of industrialized countries."

Until recently all human activities and their results were considered within the framework of individual countries and sectors (energy, agriculture, trade) and classified on the basis of problems (ecological, economic, social). Such a classification is becoming gradually obsolete. This particularly applies to the various global "crises," which had become objects of social concern primarily in the last decade. It is not a question of some separate and independent crises, such as those of the environment, development, or energy but of a single crisis which combines all of them into a single one.

The planet is experiencing a period of dramatic growth and radical change. Five billion people must squeeze themselves in the limited space on earth in order to make space for double the number of fellow-human beings. According to United Nations projections, the population on the planet could stabilize in the 21st century on the level of 8 to 14 billion. More than 90 percent of the growth will be in the poor countries and 90 percent of that growth will be in the overcrowded cities.

The current global economic output amounts to \$13 trillion; in the next 50 years it could be increased by a factor of 5-10. In the past 100 years industrial output has increased by a factor of more than 50; four-fifths of this growth have taken place since 1950. These figures reflect the tremendous burden placed on the biosphere in the course of building, development of transportation, agriculture, and industry, for economic growth is largely taking place at the expense of the resources of forests, soils, seas and rivers.

The main trend of economic growth is the development of new technologies which, although making the more economical use of nonrecoverable resources possible, are also becoming additional sources of danger, by creating previously unknown forms of pollution and causing the appearance of living organisms which did not previously exist in nature and which could affect the course of evolutionary processes.

These changes have created different interrelationships between the global economy and global ecology. In the past we were concerned with the influence which a developing economy had on the environment. Today we must also be concerned with the effect which economic stress, such as the degradation of soil and forests and disturbances of water systems and atmospheric processes, has on economic growth.

In the recent past we became aware of the fact that the economic interdependence among countries had drastically increased. Today we must accustom ourselves to thinking in terms of their increasing ecological interdependence. Ecology is becoming increasingly interwoven with economics on the local, regional, national and global levels, blending within a single cluster of causes and consequences.

In the past decade concern about life-threatening ecological problems appeared in the developing world as well. Increasingly the rural areas are suffering because of the increased number of farmers and the scarcity of land. The cities are overcrowded with people, automobiles and factories.

These countries are experiencing the consequences of the fact that they are increasingly falling behind the industrial countries in terms of the availability of resources and the domination of the industrial world in controlling some key international structures; they are forced to function under conditions in which developed industrial countries have already made use of most of the planetary ecological capital. An inequality has developed, which is the main problem of the "environment," while also being the main problem of global "development."

Today in most developing countries real per capita income is lower than it was at the beginning of the decade. Increasing poverty and unemployment are augmenting the pressure on the environment, for they are forcing an increasing number of people to rely exclusively on environmental resources. Many governments are obstructing measures taken to protect the environment and ignoring ecological aspects in planning their development.

The ecological crisis, which is intensifying and spreading, is a threat to national security and even to the survival of the population, a threat which could worsen the better armed and the more hostile either neighbors or hostile alliances become. Already now, in some areas of Latin America, Asia and Africa the degradation of the environment is becoming a source of political instability and tension in relations among countries. Nonetheless, the governments of the overwhelming percentage of countries interested in ecological protection continue to waste a great deal more funds in protecting themselves from the threat of invasion by enemy forces than, let us say, the invasion of the desert.

Military expenditures in the world amount to \$1 trillion annually and are continuing to increase. In many countries military activities absorb such a high percentage of the GNP that it is becoming a major obstacle to the implementation of their development plans. As in the past, governments are approaching the problem of their security on the basis of traditional concepts. This is most clearly visible in the efforts to achieve such security by improving the systems of nuclear armaments which are potentially capable of destroying the planet. Studies have indicated that a "nuclear winter" which would follow even a limited nuclear war, would destroy plant and animal ecosystems and would leave few survivals on a devastated planet.

The arms race in all parts of the world is exhausting resources which could be used to prevent an ecological crisis and to eliminate social injustice.

We are borrowing the fixed capital of the environment from future generations with no intention of repaying it. They could curse us for our wastefulness but will never be able to recover this debt, for deprived of the right to vote, they have no political or financial power and are unable to dispute decisions made today.

However, mankind can stabilize the development process in such a way that it could meet its present needs without creating difficulties to be faced by future generations. The suggested idea of stable development determines the limit of growth, not its absolute "ceiling" but limitations which are objectively dictated by the contemporary level of technology and social organization, and the ability of the biosphere to "digest" the products of human activities. However, in order to lay a path to a new age of economic growth, we must improve technology and social organization. The commission is confident that the poverty widespread in the world is not inevitable today. Stable development requires the satisfaction of the basic needs of all people and offering to all the opportunity of realizing their aspirations for a better life. A world in which poverty exists dooms itself to ecological and other catastrophes. The fast growth of the population can increase the pressure on resources and slow down improvements in living standards. Therefore, a stable development is possible only with a harmonious correlation between the size of the population and economic progress, on the one hand, and the existing productive potential of the biosphere, on the other.

Finally, a stable development is not some kind of fixed condition of harmony but rather a process of change in the course of which the exploitation of resources, the area of capital investments and the orientation of technological progress and institutional change will be harmonized with future needs to the same extent as it is with the needs of the present. It would be a mistake, however, to believe that this process could take place easily and without complications. It involves making some painful decisions on occasion. That is why, in the final account, a stable development must be based on a political will.

So far, a typical reaction of governments to the headlong broad global changes has been a total unwillingness to realize the need for change in their own policies. The challenges hurled at mankind form an integral complex, which requires comprehensive approaches and active participation in seeking answers by the broadest possible population strata. Meanwhile, most organizations today which deal with such problems try to function independently of each other. Their areas of activity are limited. They work in relatively narrow directions and in a state of virtual lack of public control. Those who are responsible for the utilization of natural resources and the protection of the environment are organizationally separated from those who are responsible for economic growth. The real world, with its closely interwoven economic and ecological systems will, naturally, remain the same but the strategy of the organizations involved in their functioning must change.

The need for efficient international cooperation in organizing the efficient interaction among ecological and economic processes is increasing. Conversely, the trust put in international organizations dealing with such problems is declining and the help they receive is diminishing.

Concern with ecological problems was the consequence of the catastrophes caused by the headlong economic growth in the postwar period. Under the pressure of the citizens of their countries, the governments realized the need to correct the alarming situation which had appeared and set up special ministries and agencies to deal with problems of environmental protection. Many of them have achieved substantial successes within the range of their competence, such as improving the condition of the air and the water and the protection of other natural resources. However, their activities have been essentially directed toward eliminating the already caused harm, such as replanting forests and desert lands, reshaping the urban environment, etc.

Economic and sectorial ministries and departments are excessively concerned with the growth rates of output. Their functions frequently end with the production process, whereas the struggle against paralleling pollution becomes the concern exclusively of environmental protection authorities.

Major corrections must be made also in the activities of international agencies related to providing aid, controlling trade, developing agriculture, and so on.

In order to be able to anticipate and prevent ecological catastrophes, we must consider ecological aspects of policy as also being related to economics, trade, energy, agriculture and others. This must be done on the same level and by the very same national and international organizations.

Such a reorientation is one of the main institutional requirements of the 1990s and beyond. To many countries which are either too poor or too small or else have limited organizational opportunities, it would prove difficult to make the necessary changes in their own departments without outside financial and technical support and aid in cadre training. However, the changes dictated by our time cannot bypass a single country, big or small, rich or poor.

"The next several decades," the report emphasizes, "will be decisive. The time has come to reject the previous forms which fettered us. Efforts to preserve social and ecological stability with the old approaches to the development and protection of the environment can only increase instability. Security can be achieved only through change.

"The commission has earmarked a number of steps which must be taken in order to reduce the threat to the survival of mankind and so that further development may become more stable. We also realize, however, that such a reorientation is simply impossible to achieve with the existing mechanisms for decision making and the existing national and international agencies.

"...In order to allow future generations the possibility of choice our generation must begin to act immediately and to unite."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

'Why Did I Decide to Write This Letter?'

18020005i Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 106-108

[Letter to the editors by Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Ivanov, Kanashevskiy Sovkhoz, Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon, Chelyabinsk Oblast]

[Text] To the editors:

Why did I decide to write this letter? The thoughts I would like to share have bothered me long and incessantly. I am an engineer working in a sovkhoz. My entire life has been spent in the countryside and, it so happened, mainly dealing with equipment.

In the course of my work, which I have been doing for the past 18 years, I have seen, naturally "from my own church steeple," both technical progress in the countryside as well as its pluses and minuses. Now, when the question of restructuring has become pressing, I would say that one of the bottlenecks in improving our entire way of life is the agrarian sector. Trying to solve its problems with the existing level of technical facilities would be simply nurturing a hope (understandably, this is strictly my personal opinion).

Naturally, I am familiar with the resolutions which our party and government have adopted on this problem which has been quite extensively discussed in the press and on television. Nonetheless we, the rural population, lack the confidence that things are moving.

I have had to service and work with DT-54 and ISK-4 models. Today we are dealing with a new generation of tractors, grain combines, feed processors and other machinery. Ever more frequently I ask whether we have made great progress in developing efficient (and not only productive, which machine builders emphasize) agricultural equipment?

If we consider the technological standard, the quality of a number of models (all plows without exception, many cultivators, such as the KPS-4, the PSYe-12 tractor hitch, the KSK-100, KPKU-75, KPS-5G feed processing equipment, one could go on forever, one can only yearn for the DT-54 "workhorse," and the "Truzhenik-4" plow of the P-5-35. Naturally, the cabin of the T-150K cannot be compared to that of the DT-54 and nor are working conditions with the Niva combine comparable to those of the SK-4. But then we have the results of the work and the satisfaction of mechanizers with working conditions.... There may have been cases, although I have never seen one, of a mechanizer who has gone back to driving a tractor after becoming a truck driver.

Or else let us consider the output of DT-54 and DT-75 tractors over a period of 7 or 8 years: the latter has excelled in only that it costs more, running it is more costly and it breaks down quite frequently. A great deal could be written about it, but let me say this only: many comrades who make decisions on such matters are restructuring themselves all too slowly or are else merely pretending to be restructuring themselves.

I shall cite a number of examples, noteworthy in my view. We have a T-4A-model tractor. I hope the comrades in the Altay will not be insulted, but our mechanizers have nicknamed it "Punishment." Usually, this model is assigned to someone considered guilty of some infraction, for no self-respecting mechanizer would take it. Yes, this tractor has a number of qualities. It is productive in the fields, particularly in plowing, but only under ideally dry conditions; it has a number of reliable assemblies, such as a gearbox and an economical engine. But that is all. At the end of his shift the mechanizer is completely exhausted, for if the soil is even slightly moist this tractor will collect all the dirt it can. After 4 years of normal use, all this tractor can contribute to the far is losses. Do the plant workers know this? Last year, in the "Time" program we saw the presentation of a T-4A tractor to a frontranking mechanizer in the presence of the general director of the plant. All of these faults were mentioned to him by the mechanizer but the director, as though deaf, answered: "Well, we shall improve the design, the wheels and the cabin." Not a word was said

that a new, a high quality tractor is needed. We know that they have a new model with a flexible suspension. How long shall we be waiting for it?

We have many people who are in charge of the production of equipment for the countryside. Perhaps they too should be shaken up and stop referring, as they usually do, to objective difficulties. Let these comrades not feel hurt by such criticism from the countryside.

Here is another example. Recently the central press criticized farm managers for being nearsighted, allowing the grain perish under the snow rather than accepting Yenisey combines. But why are we saying that one should reduce the load of a grain combine? In my view, because if grain combines continue to be made with such quality, soon the seasonal norm would average 20-30 hectares per combine. I am not even mentioning the problem of mechanizer cadres, for their earnings during harvest time should be discussed elsewhere. This type of combine works 2 to 3 years, after which it needs extensive repairs, although its service life is estimated at 9 years.

Here as well we have the high cost of repairs, rebuilding and more losses. Nothing is said of the fact that this machine is used one month a year. In that same "Time" program, a correspondent enthusiastically said that a prototype had been developed for an attachment for fodder processing for the Don-1500. Kolkhoz chairmen were also found, who praised the model. How can we understand this? This model costs more than 20,000 rubles, weighs more than 11 tons and will be pushing a harvesting attachment. Is this a statesman-like solution of the problem? In my view, someone may be looking for a praise or perhaps the "Don" model needs further publicity, for this harvest as well it widely criticized. It is being said that this combine will be operational for a longer period of time. Actually, in fodder procurement a situation will be reached in which we would be harvesting the grain with scythes!

I would like to raise another question. What should we do to make the machine builders responsible for their creations? The moment the machines leave the plant, they claim that "in the villages they are being poorly handled, people are ignorant and careless..."

In my view, the situation is as follows: let us assume that Rostselmash starts to supply its "Don" to us, in Chelyabinsk Oblast. It should have here its own servicing firm and support center, where plant specialists would not only look at irregularities in the guaranteed machinery (wherever such a service exists it is more to help the plant shift the blames to the farms rather than consider the low quality), but operate along with a vocational training system for cadres, and hold seminars with engineering and technical personnel in charge of operating the equipment produced by the plant. The bottom line should be the following: if the machine builders

would assume part of our ill-starred rural worries concerning repairs and technical servicing (perhaps only for tractors and grain combines and the KSK-100 and KPS-5G) the need for equipment would diminish drastically and a great deal of work on the farm would be completed on time and without outside help.

Indeed, rural labor productivity remains low. Comrade V.G. Kostakov wrote in *KOMMUNIST* (No 14, 1987) that it is one fifth that of the United States. There is some truth in that. What is hindering us? The hindrances are numerous and a great deal is being written and spoken about them. I, however, would go back to the question of the equipment.

Mechanizers spend a good half of their working time in assembling, finishing and remachining and repairing new equipment. The quality of even our best tractor, the MTZ, has begun to slip.

Another aspect of the question is the great scarcity of truly needed equipment or its total lack. On all levels we are being told that there is a scarcity of metal, capacities are small, and so on. No, the reason is entirely different: the producers' diktat. Such producers are the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Gosplan and the machine building plants. There is sufficient metal. Recently our sovkhos received a harrow for presowing soil cultivation. It took 280 man/hours to assemble it. We started hitching it to the K-700 and to get it out from the machine yard to the sovkhos department. Not one of the hydraulic hoses can withstand the pressure of this machine which weighs several tons. After the harvest, we shall redo it our own way, for essentially the idea of it is good. However, it has a great deal of unnecessary metal and probably the result has been a good of money earned by the plant, for fulfilling its gross output plan!

Industry produces the RSP-10 and the KTU-10A feed-distribution machines. Ask today any farm manager which of the two he needs more and in which he has more confidence. It would be the KTU-10A, although it too is far from perfect. However, industry finds it more profitable to produce the RSP-10, for it takes as much metal as three KTU-10A. It is time to increase deliveries of sufficiently reliable 2PTS-4 tractor trailer, as any mechanizer could tell you. We also urgently need T-16A-model tractors with a grab bucket and are short of PE-0.8A loaders; production should be increased of the excellent "Karpatsky PEA-1.0 grab bucket which would save a great deal of manual labor in animal husbandry and crop-growing.

There is currently a shortage of caterpillar tractors and, although I mentioned their low quality, even they are unavailable. We, in the countryside, believe that a caterpillar tractor under the conditions of our country and the size of the farms, could be replaced neither by the K-700 nor the T-150K, as confirmed by this year's harvest and by agronomists. Does the countryside today

need the K-700 with its hundreds of horsepower? Let everyone think about it! Meanwhile, we greatly need a good caterpillar tractor. Obviously, in this case we should look less abroad in the search for similar models. For quite some time we have been waiting for the heavily advertised T-150 "Volgar" (caterpillar modification). Production capacities exist, the working class is working, there is metal, and all we need is the tractor.

No, dear editors, I do not suggest a change in the plant which manufactures the "Kirovets." However, some thought should be given to that model. We are short of powerful loaders. Such loaders are being made by skillful rural workers themselves. For the past few years journals have described how powerful loading facilities could be attached to the K-700, thus ensuring the proper work of that model.

Here is a simple example. Rough fodder is hauled for processing in fodder yards. The K-700 tractor pulls two trailers, hauling 15-20 tons of hay, yet it takes 2 hours to load this machine with an MTZ tractor stacker. Amazingly, here as well the comrades at the ministry "see nothing and hear nothing."

And what about snow-drifts in the countryside! Instead of giving real help, we hear "praises" about how the people work with dedication in snowstorms, feeding the cattle, milking, and so on. Why could that same Kirovskiy Zavod not supply a bulldozer attachment to its equipment, which would immediately solve our problem? Under the new economic management conditions when the diktat of the consumer will become basic (we have faith that this will happen), the fate of the K-700 will be the same as that of the "Yenisey" combine.

Finally, there is the question of the repair base of sovkhoses and kolkhoses. In the course of my work, I have not seen a single occasion in which a farm has been given a new lathe, perhaps other than in the case of the "lucky ones," which are given new large repair workshops. Yes, there was a time when we, farmers, would simply work in the fields and livestock farms while Selkhoztekhnika would assume the burden of machine repairs and servicing. Everything received in the past 20 years went there. Life, however, decided otherwise: so far, most of the repairs are done by the farms themselves. What is amazing is that a great deal is being said about restructuring in the countryside while technical support is becoming worse and worse. The year 1987 is nearing its end and meanwhile we have not received a single tool, not a single turning blade, not a single meter of pipe. We are short of electric welding equipment or, more accurately, we do not even have the money to pay for it.

Starting with 1 January 1988 we must convert to full cost-accounting, i.e., self-support and self-financing and, we hope, greater autonomy. But as we consider the

technical facilities in the countryside and everything I described to you, dear comrades, a great many questions remain and the answers in some cases do not depend on us alone.

Currently foundations are being laid for planning the 13th and 14th 5-year periods. I would very much like to hope that here as well restructuring will follow the right way, for otherwise reducing manpower in agriculture by 10 million people, as comrade Kostakov writes in that same article, would be a pious wish or else the stream of members of the working class "going to the aid" of the countryside will increase.

Respectfully, your reader Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Ivanov.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

Going Back to the 'Nezhin Story,' Readers' Discussion

18020005j Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 108-112

[Text] V. Chubinskiy, head of the Department of the International Communist, Worker and National Liberation Movements, Leningrad Higher Party School, professor, doctor of historical sciences, Leningrad:

I fully share the thoughts expressed by G. Vodolazov and A. Volkov in their letter "Nezhin Story," which was published in your journal's issue No 13 for 1987. I would like to add a few considerations.

It seems to me that the case of G. Strashko reflects some features of our social life, things which which, in the course of restructuring, must be uncompromisingly fought.

It is a question, above all, of the deeply rooted idea that the social sciences exist not for the sake of the study of development trends and contradictions in reality but for depicting reality as one would like to see it, i.e., embellishing it to suit predetermined concepts. (And although speaking of the science, I also have in mind teaching and propaganda, for they must rest on a scientific base). Efforts to break this prejudice and provide a truthful picture of life led, in the past, not only to lack of understanding and protest but also to political accusations and even the punishment of "dare-devils." As the Nezhin experience indicates, and this is not an isolated case, such things are happening to this day. Old habits are strong. In the past few months numerous letters have been published in the press, the authors of which have threatened scientists, writers and journalists they criticize with sending copies of their writings to relevant agencies. It is quite indicative that an opinion expressed in the press is considered by some as an enemy "sally,"

which should be punished by the state. Although it may appear that the time of the cult of Stalin's personality, with its mass reprisals and denouncements, is a thing of the past, it turns out that it is alive and quite unwilling to die (incidentally, this is yet one more argument in favor of the definitive and uncompromising reckoning with the dark sides of the past).

However, if we are to expect of the social sciences fruitful studies of the real world and help in political practices, proper conditions to this effect must be provided. In particular, we must comprehensively instill the concept of the role, functions and methods used in the social sciences, consistent with the creative spirit of Marxism-Leninism and develop a proper attitude toward scientific research. This must be done not simply on the basis of general considerations and appeals but also by waging a consistent struggle against phenomena similar to the one in Nezhin. In turn, this requires a radical restructuring or, if you wish, the breakdown of psychological stereotypes which have been adopted by a substantial percentage of our ideological cadres.

Unfortunately, the members of leading committees have not deemed it necessary to consult with a specialist. In matters of chemistry or physics they would probably do so but in the areas of the social sciences everyone imagines himself a specialist. However, having assumed the functions of a specialist, judging by the results of their actions, they have displayed total lack of competence in the specific problems discussed in G. Strashko's lecture, and a lack of understanding of the tasks of the social sciences, which is totally intolerable under the conditions of restructuring, and of the requirements the social sciences must meet today.

Does this not mean that the level of theoretical training of many workers in the ideological area is still not on the necessary level? Generally speaking, in cases such as the one in Nezhin, should we not decline to be some sort of judges and executors in matters which are topics of scientific research and debates? Should we not acknowledge that such obligations should be fulfilled only in the case of improper cadre policy, persecution of people who think differently, personal quarrels and other abuses which have essentially nothing to do with the solution of scientific problems?

V. Vydryakov, CPSU member since 1956, agronomist, Kherson:

I read "Nezhin Story" with a great deal of interest. What is the reason for this story? I believe that we should single out two features: a. the fear which is still fettering and paralyzing the minds of the people ever since the time of the cult of personality; b. the consequences of the "cult of mediocrity."

Your publication of this article is a very good thing and I thank you for it.

A. Kireyev, CPSU member since 1941, Moscow:

In my view, Strashko's "lecture" indicates permissiveness and an irresponsible attitude toward one's statements. The authors of the letter to KOMMUNIST themselves state that "naturally, we deal in political matters and in this case it would be desirable to have fewer errors. This area requires a particularly careful weighing of assessments, their maximally possible substantiation, and a delicate treatment of the complex instruments of knowledge of social life and of what influences it." Do such requirements not apply to Strashko? Understandably, the institute may have overdone it in its assessment of the "lecture." It could have discussed it, as the authors of the letter to the journal recommend. Actually, there was nothing to discuss, for the lecturer had no written text! Had such a lecture been recorded on tape and, subsequently, heard by specialists, the nonsense expressed by comrade Strashko may have become clear; possibly, the authors of the letter may have reached a different conclusion....

Let us pity our propaganda. It has seen and heard everything! Now it has its new oracles of the Strashko variety, and no one has the right to remark on this for such a thing is considered "gross administrative interference which could cause much greater harm than inaccuracies and even errors" (!). It turns out that the "seeker of justice" was nonetheless punished by the KPK, which strictly pointed out to him the errors he had included in his lecture; and if the KPK has said so, this is no joke and I would take a look at the authors of the letter to see if they too, God forbid, have received a stern notice by the KPK!

From the following members of the Department of International Activities of the CPSU, Minsk Higher Party School: A. Chelyabinskiy, department head, candidate of historical sciences; V. Zhagora, candidate of philosophical sciences; V. Kuzminov, candidate of historical sciences; I. Osinskiy, candidate of historical sciences; A. Rozanov, candidate of historical sciences; and V. Ukhvanov, candidate of philosophical sciences, Minsk:

We believe that the journal's article is quite relevant. Using a specific example, it depicts a problem which is frequently encountered of late by those engaged in scientific research and propaganda. It implies the existence of a grave contradiction between the appeal of the 27th CPSU Congress for a daring and creative approach in the study of new contemporary phenomena and the still extant stereotypes, inability and even unwillingness to understand the essence of the tasks set by the party concerning the creative development of Marxist-Leninist social sciences. This article brings into the open a phenomenon which was concealed for a long time and which, if you wish, is of an alarming nature, warning us of the possibility that such conflict situations may be repeated.

Incidentally, we too heard the "alarm signal." We too have heard accusations of "objectivism," and inability to provide an ideologically weighed assessment of events and facts in international life.

Here is an interesting detail: in labor collectives, in worker audiences above all, and in discussions with propagandists the desire to present the real, the truthful picture of achievements and difficulties experienced by the international communist movement meets with understanding and support. Nonetheless, the reaction of some colleagues to even the most timid efforts to undertake a discussion in an atmosphere of frankness and openness is frequently quite painful. This is a manifestation of the active rejection of nonstandard approaches and interpretations which have not been codified in textbooks. Amazingly, even noting obvious and universally known facts, such as, for example, the slowed-down pace of socioeconomic development of the socialist countries by the turn of the 1980s, is considered seditious.

In the appeal to the readers, which was published in issue No 12 of this journal, you ask what new realities of social life require collective discussion at roundtable editorial meetings. We believe that one such important topic is a consideration of how to surmount the inertia of dogmatic thinking and how to engage in a discussion on vital and unstudied theoretical problems.

L. Koloskov, CPSU member since 1951, reserve officer, Baku:

I am inclined to see in this entire story one of the most malicious manifestations of resistance to restructuring, a most real "warning" "not to show off." How far we still are from the open, the democratic exchange of views and search for the truth in the course of a dispute. All too frequently we remain in the power of the "tempestuous applause," unanimous resolutions, someone's opinions and formulas and prescriptions applicable to all cases in life. Above all, there is the insurmountable desire to see things the way we want or need them to be, but not as they actually are. How easy it still is, in the majority of cases, to strike at people who show an independent way of thinking and who express it. How strong remains the concern not for a cause or truth but for one's skin. This is quite frequently manifested in the avoidance of controversy.

The views of the rector and the party authorities which ratified and corrected the decisions of the institute's party authorities cannot withstand criticism from any viewpoint, and even less so from the positions of principle mindedness and absence of prejudice.

The result of such actions and fears will be a lack of personal views, thoughts and frank statements. The victim, however, has also learned not to deliver lectures on vital problems, not to mention expressing his own

opinions.... Enough! We taught him a lesson.... (this is the reaction hoped for by the organizers of such campaigns for the purity of "ideas and thoughts").

Independent and thinking people have always been needed, and even more so now. For claims to possessing the ultimate truth and faith in a simple assessment of events are very costly. We must ensure the support not of those whom we find convenient but those who are honest, who sincerely care for the common interests and not for settling private matters, hiding behind ideological "orthodoxy." Errors are not all that terrible unless they reach the point of absurdity. It is worse when active people are being penalized in the hope that everything will go back to normal, as has frequently been the case.

I believe that this article is very important and worthy of a serious discussion and of taking steps. I also believe that the authors have somewhat mollified their assessments of the described facts.

Letters from Nezhin

B. Sagalakov, G. Ovsyannikova, Ye. Gomenyuk and A. Buchin:

We, members of the Department of Philosophy and Political Economy, Nezhin State Pedagogical Institute, thank you for the article. Actually, ever since G.G. Strashko delivered his lecture, this entire story began to turn into an absurdity. However, there was nothing we could do about it. People were openly trying to settle their accounts with him because of his exigency in his work and ability to tell the truth. What was most unexpected was the fact that this matter assumed a political nature on the initiative of V.S. Siplivets, party gorkom first secretary. It was on his request that views on the lecture began to be collected from people whose relations with Gennadiy Grigoryevich were stressed.

For the past 2 years, and to this day, the members of the department who supported Strashko have not had an easy life. Now, when thanks to your article no political implication can be ascribed to this matter, it has begun to be reduced down to Gennadiy Grigoryevich's personality. The question of restoring him to his position as department head remains open and we find it increasingly difficult to work. The entire institute is now interested in the existing situation, and the moral and working situation in our institute and, to a large extent, in the city, will greatly depend on whether justice will prevail in Strashko's case.

Ye. Strashko, docent:

Your article "Nezhin Story" allows me too, as Gennadiy Grigoryevich Strashko's wife, to express my opinion on a matter which has gained union-wide notoriety.

My 2 years of "public silence" was infinitely painful and, at times, something which today I have the right to say, simply tragic. Some of my colleagues gave me "comradely" advice not to take up my husband's defense at party meetings, for this would allegedly "intensify the subjectivistic aspect" in assessing the lecture and will aggravate the fanning of human passions. And although the history of our party is rich in such facts, afraid of harming my husband, I sympathized with him in silence.

You may believe me that the lightning development of events and the increased strictness of penalties, as the case wound its way upward, had a simply staggering groundlessness. At first I could not believe that these penalties were approved by sensible people and it seemed to me that at any moment everything will become clear and settled. Alas...

Some days were like nightmares and there were minutes of horrifying disappointment: only yesterday one of my colleagues would refer to Gennadiy Grigoryevich in superlatives and today, without shame, would denounce his own statement and would worriedly, claim to have said the exact opposite, for the sake of pleasing others. It is thus that surreptitiously a "new" negative background was being created around my husband and a kind of social vacuum was being developed. It was such an immorality that was most depressing and is hurtful to this day. For 18 months students as well could witness a series of unsupported accusations against my husband. Our institute is small, for which reason various statements immediately became known to the students. There were questions which bothered us: did they believe that Gennadiy Grigoryevich is an "anti-Soviet" and a "apolitical teacher;" have they lost faith in the most important concepts he instilled in them and taught them to defend? How to explain to them that one should be able to oppose such exaggerated arrogance and ambitious incompetence by displaying firmness of spirit, confidence and inflexibility of mind and the desire and ability to fight to the end?

Fortunately, unlike some colleagues with fluctuating views, the students were able to understand for themselves all that was taking place. An anonymous survey among students, conducted by the rectorate with a view to determining the quality of teaching of social disciplines, convincingly proved that the slanders addressed at my husband had not influenced the high assessment given to his work.

The "Nezhin Story" convinced me and my comrades, once again, that truth, the highest philosophy of life, is invincible, however thorny its way to the minds and hearts of the people may be.

O. Rostovskaya, candidate of historical sciences, party group organizer, Department of CPSU History and Scientific Communism, Nezhin State Pedagogical Institute, party obkom lecturer:

My confidence is growing that the social sciences are assuming their proper place in restructuring social awareness. However, there is still a struggle to be fought, particularly in some areas. The main obstacle is the incompetence of a number of middle-level ideological workers with the right to decide the fate of VUZ teachers. But then "the intelligentsia is called intelligentsia precisely because it reflects and expresses the development of class interests and political groups throughout society more consciously, firmly and accurately than anyone else" (V.I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 7, p 343).

The publication in *KOMMUNIST* was considered seriously. The people understood and believed. This is the most widely read journal in the city. However, we find it difficult to answer the question "how did this story end?" The more so since even some of our colleagues, social scientists, find the whole thing "puzzling:" why was it necessary to turn to the CPSU Central Committee, for a year would pass and the party penalty would be lifted, as it were....

We are pleased to note the greater attention paid to statements by lecturers in the social sciences. Communicating with people has become easier. The equivocal situation of social scientists and the gap between official and real levels of awareness is closing.

History is indicative and anyone must draw lessons from it and be answerable for violations of the Leninist style of management and the party's statutory requirements.

Who will remove the "sword of Damocles of political accusations", which is what creates silent philistine "wise men," rather than "true communists, who can defeat lies and prejudices and help the working people to defeat the old order...?" (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 41, p 404).

From the Editors

Naturally, we could make only partial use of the responses received to our publication. Many letters were received (some of them describing similar stories). The authors are unanimous in their evaluation and the letter by A. Kireyev is the exception, the only one of its kind in this mail. The readers are concerned by the problems posed and both communists and nonparty people see behind the facts major shortcomings in ideological work methods and style. Dogmatism and formalism, the habit of thinking and acting within the framework of frozen patterns and systems, and other inertial factors which hinder restructuring in the areas of ideology, education and upbringing, are being felt tangibly.

Something else. Naturally, a party committee on any level could formulate views on one aspect of communist activities or another. The question is how it is done, whether competently or not. In his Leningrad speech, M.S. Gorbachev noted how necessary it is for cadres on

any level "to realize that in talking with the people only one method is acceptable, that of persuasion, and that only one form, a dialogue among equals, is possible." These methods and forms are Leninist. They were born when our party was founded and any neglect of them is always fraught with serious errors and moral costs in working with people and in approaching individuals.

As the letters of G. Strashko's colleagues show, the "Nezhin Story" remains unfinished. Nor have the editors received an answer from those who should provide such an answer for reasons of party duty or direct official obligations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

Books on Victorious October

18020005k Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 113-115

[Text] V.S. Orlov and Ye.A. Sultanova. "Syezd Vosstavshogo i Povedivshogo Naroda" [Congress of the Risen and Victorious People]. Second expanded edition. Lenizdat, Leningrad, 1987, 224 pp. V.I. Startsev. "Sh-turm Zimnego" [The Storming of the Winter Palace]. Documentary essay. Lenizdat, Leningrad, 1987, 136 pp. Reviewed by M. Ivanov.

These two books, published by Lenizdat on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, are dissimilar in nature and presentation. Both, however, deal with the culminating events which took place during the same short time segment—24 and 25 October—when the armed uprising which had broken out in Petrograd, reached its apogee and ended victoriously. The result was the establishment of the first Soviet government and the promulgation of the first decrees, the decrees on land and peace.

The authors of "Syezd Vosstavshogo i Pobedivshogo Naroda" have made public little known facts which offer a more complete idea of the nature and significance of the decisions which were made at the initial session of the congress, and Lenin's role in the preparation for and holding of this historical forum. Included in the book are also new documents filed in Leningrad's party archives.

For example, the list of members of the bolshevik faction at the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Soviets, the original of which is kept in the Leningrad party archives, is of great interest. Comparing it with the general list of delegates, which was published in 1928, the investigations conducted by the Istpart and other documents, the authors have identified several dozen names previously unmentioned in publications on the congress.

It is extremely regrettable that statements made at the congress were not recorded. Minutes were not kept and not even rough drafts of secretaries have been preserved. However, based on the painstaking study of newspaper reports of the period, surveys of participants in the congress and recollections of eyewitnesses, to their great credit the authors have been able to reconstruct the course of the sessions, the order in which the speakers took the floor and their statements, and to recreate the very atmosphere in Smolny assembly hall and bring to light the main developments in the struggle which broke out at the congress between bolsheviks and conciliationists.

As a whole, this book is captivating for its clear methodological approach, thoroughness of presentation, careful study of events and ability to sum up numerous facts. It introduces a great deal of new features in an already thoroughly researched area. This proves once again that the inexhaustible topic of the October Revolution needs further innovative research.

V.I. Startsev's documentary essay "Shturm Zimnego" is the first to consider with such thoroughness the deployment of forces on the eve of the seizure of the bulwark of the counterrevolution, providing details on the practical implementation of the Leninist plan for an armed uprising in terms of the choice of the time of action, the correlation of forces and the areas in which the rebels struck their hardest blows.

The reader will also find information about the human and material resources at the disposal of the two sides at the time of the storming and the manner in which the Winter Palace was surrounded and seized. The author names all subunits of soldiers and seamen which participated in the storming, the Red Army detachments of Petersburg plants, the naval vessels of the Baltic Fleet and the number of people who participated in the storming (about 11,000). He describes their actions, from giving the signal to the detention of the Provisional Government.

The thorough study of sources enable us to refute the inaccuracy of a number of different historical versions.

One such "fact" is the shelling of the Winter Palace by the "Avrora" after the signal was given with a red lantern raised on the flagstaff of the bastion at the Petropavlovsk fortress. This version, the author writes, has been making its way for decades from one memoir to another and repeatedly mentioned in essays and works of fiction on the storming of the Winter Palace (see pp 96-97). It was only after an experiment conducted at the place where the cruiser was moored at the Nikolayev bridge, that it was established that from that point the Petropavlovka cannot be seen. Based on documents (which, incidentally, were published as early as the start of the 1920s), V.I. Startsev restores in detail the circumstances surrounding

the giving of the historical signal. There was first a blank shot fired with a 3-inch gun, immediately repeated by the 6-inch bow gun of the "Avrora."

Prevailing opinion notwithstanding, the author proves that the revolutionary cruiser did not fire live shells at the palace. The artillery fire came from the Petropavlovsk fort, the Neva branch and the Naryshkin bastion. All in all, as the author states, some 40 shots with live ammunition, from machine guns and shell shrapnel, were fired at the Winter Palace (see p 105). Actually, the hits at the palace were insignificant (see p 106). Other different historical versions are also substantiatedly refuted.

These books on the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Soviets and on the storming of the Winter Palace, timed for publication for the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, will unquestionably enrich our knowledge on the events of those days and help us to visualize more clearly those greatest events of our age in all their specifics and details.

"Moskva. Oktyabr. Revolyutsiya" [Moscow. October. Revolution]. Collection. Moskovskiy Rabochiy, Moscow, 1987, 495 pp. Reviewed by N. Belous.

Petrograd was destined to become the cradle of the October Revolution, as decreed by history. The armed uprising took place here quickly, decisively and purposefully. In Moscow it started later, after the news of the overthrow of the Provisional Government had already spread throughout the country. It was precisely here that the struggle for Soviet power assumed a protracted nature, becoming quite stubborn, fierce and bloody, and filled with dramatic events. Unlike Petrograd, where the revolution was virtually bloodless, in Moscow there were many killed and wounded on both sides during the street fighting which lasted some 8 days. It was only on the evening of 2 November that the forces of the counter-revolution capitulated.

The collection of documents and memoirs, published by Izdatelstvo Moskovskiy Rabochiy, is a narration of the events of those October days. By now researchers looking in various archives throughout the country have found more than 500 different documents on the preparations for and making of the October Revolution in Moscow. Two hundred of them—the most important and significant—have been included in this publication by its compilers. A clear picture of the exciting events which took place in Moscow emerges from the appeals and addresses of the Moscow RSDWP(b) Committee to workers and soldiers, full of revolutionary passion, from the profoundly emotional lines of resolutions adopted at meetings and the dry minutes of sessions, newspaper reports on the most important events in the city, official bulletins, brief cables read over the telephone, detailed reports on combat operations at Moscow's barricades, the brief orders of the Military-Revolutionary Committee and the chaotic discussions via direct wire linking

Headquarters to representatives of the command of the Moscow Military District. The breath of the age and the incomparable color of those unforgettable days are seen in those documents.

Fourteen of these documents have never been published before. For example, the compilers found the minutes of the sessions of the Moscow RSDWP(b) Committee, at which Lenin's April Theses were discussed along with problems of setting up the Red Guard, conducting propaganda work among the masses, and electing representatives to the SRD executive committee (see pp 51-52).

Especially valuable is a previously unpublished document "From the Report on the Work of the Military Bureau of the Moscow RSDWP(b) Committee for August-October 1917." It describes the party's work in the months which preceded the revolution and the change which took place in the mood of the worker and soldier masses and their total readiness to take up arms for a Soviet system (see pp 179-182).

Another positive feature in this work is that, in publishing the testimony of active participants in revolutionary events, the compilers have provided short biographic notes on each one of their authors. Still, perhaps they should have told us more about these people.

We believe that the collection should have included a thorough introductory article on the events of the spring, summer and autumn of 1917 in Moscow. The small preface of slightly more than three pages does not even set itself such a task. Yet this is a feature of essential importance.

Historical studies made of the revolutionary events in Moscow analyzed a long time ago the errors which were made in the preparations for and, particularly, in carrying out the armed uprising. We know that the leaders of the VRK showed inadmissible slowness and indecisiveness, losing the initiative to the enemy, entering with him into clearly useless talks and even agreeing to a 1-day armistice, which triggered the sharp discontent of soldiers and Red Guards. This was a violation of the most important requirement stipulated by Lenin on the eve of the revolution: once the uprising has begun, one must act with the greatest decisiveness and absolutely convert to an offensive (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 34, p 383).

Nonetheless, the collection enables us to go back once again to the dramatic events of October 1917, to look at the actual documents of that period, to hear the voices of eyewitnesses to the revolution and to understand the difficulties and trials experienced by the rebelled workers and soldiers of Moscow in striving for victory, giving their lives for the sake of the happiness of future generations.

"Oktyabrskaya Revolyutsiya. Voprosy i Otveti" [The October Revolution. Questions and Answers]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 480 pp. "Velikiy Oktyabr" [The Great October]. Brief historical-revolutionary manual. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 360 pp. Reviewed by S. Khizhnyakov.

The Soviet people, who sharply feel the live continuity of time in the course of the restructuring which has developed in the country, would like to know as much as possible about the revolutionary events of 1917 and the first steps taken by the Soviet system. Unquestionably, they will be assisted in this by two new referential works published by Politizdat.

In the first of the two, the questions are based on the chronology of events from February 1917 to March 1918. This allows the readers to follow the strict logic of historical facts and find the necessary information easier. The work includes little known facts which, to a certain extent, makes the book similar to the traditional popular-science publications on the October Revolution. In their answers, noted history specialist concisely cover central problems of one period or another, the history of the preparations for and victory of the October Revolution, and the difficult activities of the Bolshevik Party and its leadership throughout the various stages of the revolution. In a clear and easy style, the authors recreate the real picture of the confrontation between the forces of revolution and counterrevolution. They do not bypass the drama of events and the sharpness of the clashes of opinions within the Bolshevik Party, in the course of which the only true Leninist theoretical premises and practical solutions to most difficult problems were born, crystallized and honed.

It is pleasing to note that, unlike many previous works written about the October Revolution, this book is more thickly "inhabited" with actual people, although it is not free from the stereotyped presentation of some historical figures and their schematic depiction in primarily two colors—black and white. Unfortunately, in some areas historical truth becomes mixed with prejudice and with bypassing individual facts or providing unsubstantiated quotations. A lively presentation coexists side by side with enduring cliches and stereotypes. Nonetheless, as a whole the authors have taken a noticeable step forward in the approach to individual topics. Their professional standards and literary skills, something so rarely found in many historical works of a popular-science nature, are unquestionable.

The second work, which is a short historical-revolutionary illustrated manual is an original chronicle of the October Revolution. It aptly combines analytical with chronicle-documentary data. The chronicle of events is presented in a broad geographic range, which recreates their integral picture for the entire country. Unquestionably, the readers will be interested in the parts describing the most noted personalities of the October Revolution and memorable revolutionary sites in Moscow and

Leningrad. Despite all the qualities of this reference work, however, it is noted more by shortcomings similar to those cited in the preceding review.

As a whole, these publications, addressed to the mass readership, fulfill their purpose, which is to satisfy the growing need of the Soviet people to become familiar with the historical origins of present-day accomplishments and implement the tasks of ideological-moral, civic, patriotic and international upbringing. They are a contemporary contribution by historians to increasing our knowledge on the most outstanding event of the 20th century.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

05003

Ten Days and a Lifetime

180200051 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17,
Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 115-119

[Review by D. Shelestov, doctor of historical sciences, of the book by John Reed "Ten Days That Shook the World"]

[Text] On that unforgettable night in Petrograd, between 25 and 26 October 1917, a truck rolled quickly from Smolnyy to Nevskiy Prospekt, leaving behind it a trail of pamphlets. One of the people who were disseminating them was John Reed, the noted U.S. journalist.

As a direct observer of the storming of the Winter Palace that night and, subsequently, squeezing himself in the crowded assembly hall in Smolnyy, where the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Soviets was seething, naturally, he could not even imagine that his name would be included forever in the chronicle of the greatest revolution in history. However, he had perceived something which was immeasurably greater. With amazing perspicacity Reed was able to understand the true class meaning of the revolutionary struggle waged by the popular masses in Russia and to sense in the October events the birth of a new age, the age of the liberation of the working people from the yoke of the oppressors. It was this that helped him to make his own choice: Reed unconditionally took the side of V.I. Lenin and the bolsheviks.

Rising above the social horizons of his own society, this outstanding son of America also represented the new type of internationalist, born of the socialist revolution. Having made the most important decision of his life, and openly supporting the ideas of the Leninist party, he remained a loyal son of his people and dedicated all his efforts to tell the world the truth about revolutionary Russia.

In the very first post-October weeks, Reed had already clearly realized how incredibly difficult and even dangerous it would be to assert the truth of the great

revolution in the United States. However, fearlessly and, above all, for the sake of the interests of labor America, he took this step. On the eve of his return to his country, in January 1918, from the rostrum of the 3rd All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Reed gave a kind of oath-pledge. "Comrade Reed," the official report on the congress reads, "who is returning to a conservative country where imperialists rule, promises to describe to the American proletariat everything which is taking place in revolutionary Russia and he is deeply convinced that this will trigger a response among the oppressed and exploited masses."

John Reed kept his word. In slightly more than a year after that, in March 1919, his book was published in New York. Its cover read: "Ten Days That Shook the World." In the style of a documentary reportage, the author was the first to present a systematic description of the actual course of the October armed uprising in Petrograd and draw an overall picture of the establishment of a Soviet system in Russia. Despite repeated confiscations of proofs by the police and the frenzied persecution of the author, the book had three printings in the very first months and, subsequently, a fourth. It crossed the borders of the United States and was published in a number of European countries. Its march throughout the world began.

The first edition of "Ten Days..." in the Russian language reached the bookstores in 1923. It opened with two prefaces, written by V.I. Lenin and N.K. Krupskaya. Vladimir Ilich read the book, as he said, "with tremendous interest and unabated attention," probably as early as the autumn of 1919. It was soon after that that he drafted the text of the preface to it. "This book," he wrote, "I would like to see disseminated in millions of copies and translated in all languages, for it provides a truthful and unusually vivid presentation of events, which are so important in understanding what is a proletarian revolution and a dictatorship of the proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 40, p 48).

These few lines aptly characterize the sociopolitical importance of Reed's work, which describes impressively and with feeling the events of the Great October Revolution and its relevance to the age in universal history inaugurated with the "Ten Days That Shook the World."

"On the surface it may seem strange to think that a foreigner, an American, could have written this book..." Krupskaya noted in her preface. She then explained: "John Reed was not an indifferent observer. He was a passionate revolutionary, a communist, who understood the meaning of events, the meaning of the great struggle."

With great difficulty John Reed and his wife and friend Louise Bryant reached seething Petrograd in August 1917 as correspondents for the American socialist and left-radical press. The 5 months which Reed spent in

revolutionary Russia were the peak of his life. Day after day, the revolution itself taught Reed, changing him, making a communist out of him. However, every day and every hour he absorbed each of its unique events, facts, and features, adding to his personal observations and notes a tireless collection of all possible materials and documents. In a word, he was actively preparing to become a conscientious chronicler, realizing that he was bound to write this which he defined to himself as "the greatest topic of my life and one of the greatest topics in the world."

Back in the United States at the start of 1918, Reed planned to cover this "greatest of topics" in full in a series of works. In particular, he planned writing a book "From Kornilov to Brest-Litovsk," which would provide a broad historical canvas for the revolution, from the ripening of a nationwide revolutionary crisis in Russia, in the autumn of 1917, which led to the victory of the October armed uprising and to the establishment of the Soviet system, to its consolidation in the spring of 1918. "In my view the American people have been improperly informed about the situation in Europe, in Russia in particular..." Reed wrote in 1918. "It is time for us to learn the truth about Russia."

In order to tell this truth as soon as possible, Reed singled out the decisive period of preparations for and making of the October Revolution and by the end of 1918 the book "Ten Days That Shook the World" was completed.

"Throughout the book," the writer F. Dell noted in the first review of it published in the American press, "we see the character of Lenin growing with each page and increasingly capturing our minds...." It is difficult to disagree with this.

But does it mean that Lenin is the main character in the work and that this was precisely Reed's intention, as has been sometimes directly and unreservedly claimed in our literature? Reed described "what is a proletarian revolution." It is thus that Lenin himself briefly summarized the content of the book and it would have been unlikely for him to describe it as "truthful," had the author indeed reduced the story of the proletarian revolution in Russia merely to the implementation of the idea ascribed to him. Such a simplistic approach to the characterization of the rich and comprehensive content of the book indicates still remaining residual phenomena of that period in our historiography when major violations of the Leninist concept of the socialist revolution were allowed to occur.

A thoughtful consideration of Reed's book helps to surmount simplifications in presenting the history of the October Revolution and describing it in its entire complexity and even contradictoriness. This is a many-tiered book, which is not accidental, for such was the nature of the revolutionary process itself.

Reed's story is focused on "what is a proletarian revolution," a revolutionary people. The author convincingly proves that the bolshevik party, headed by Lenin, which represented the interests of the working class, acted in the October days of 1917 not as an external force in terms of the revolutionary masses but as an organic component of such masses, as having come from them and as heading the people who had risen. The permanent significance of Reed's book is that he not only wrote the first chronicle of the unforgettable October days of 1917 but was able, with amazing intuition, thus manifesting both the power of his talent and his acquired social perspicacity, with the help of specific data, to describe the development and strengthening of the unity of the revolutionary people and the Leninist party, which ensured the victory of the October revolution, and the depth and strength of its gains.

To Reed the revolutionary people were not an abstraction. He impressively depicts their mass actions and, at the same time, paints vivid pictures of many workers and soldiers. In general, the revolutionary events have been "settled" by the author with living people. There is something in this for us to learn. It is high time to abandon those depressing "lists" of enumerations of participants in the revolution, which was typical of some of our historians in recent decades.

To this day Reed's book remains unsurpassed in terms of depth and strength of characterization of many bolsheviks of the October cohort. We see how they, despite errors and hesitations displayed by some of them, marched with dedication at the head of the masses, led by Lenin.

However, the author by no means depicts all the leaders of the revolution in a single color. Commentators, for example, have pointed out that the author has somewhat exaggerated the role which L.D. Trotsky played in the October days. The comments on Trotsky's positions within the revolution are, unquestionably, necessary. Nonetheless, is there such a "certain exaggeration" in the book, and to what extent is it "certain?" Indeed, Trotsky frequently appears in its pages, as one of the noted figures of the October events. But that is all. We notice, by reading the book carefully, that in the events that are described this character stands as though alone, as someone who is even alien and controversial in terms of these events.

Unquestionably, the character of Lenin is one of the strongest features in Reed's book. The author described the activities of the leader of the proletariat as closely connected with the struggle of the masses in the autumn of 1917. That is why his character grows with each page of the narration on the revolution and, finally, when the action in the book reaches its highest point, the adoption of the first Soviet decrees on peace and land by the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Reed provides a portrait of Ilich which subsequently was to become basic. "It was exactly 8:40 when a thunderous wave of welcoming

shouts and applause announced the appearance of the members of the presidium and of Lenin, the great Lenin among them.... There was nothing in it resembling an idol of the crowd, but a person who was simple, loved and respected in the way, perhaps, that few leaders in history have been loved and respected. An unusual people's leader...." In remembering his first address of the congress, Reed wrote: "But then Lenin took the floor. He stood holding the edge of the pulpit, looking at the mass of delegates with screwed-up eyes and waited, obviously ignoring the growing ovation which lasted a few minutes. When it quieted down, he said, briefly and simply:

"The time has come to undertake the building of a socialist order!"

"There was a new staggering thunder of a human storm."

In the official records this statement is not to be found. The beginning of Lenin's first speech at the congress is recorded otherwise. The assumption is that Reed deliberately allowed this aberration, mixing in time a similar statement made by Lenin the previous day, in his report at the session of the Petrograd Soviet. This has been mentioned in the commentaries but, obviously, we must realize that such an error in itself is noteworthy.

Reed's book is about a great revolution. However, the author concentrates on depicting its constructive meaning, the birth of a new world which opened to mankind the horizons to the future. "To me the bolsheviks are not a destructive force but the only party in Russia with a constructive program and sufficient power to implement it," Reed wrote in winding up the book for publication. He also said: "Whatever others may be thinking about bolshevism, it is unquestionable that the Russian revolution is one of the greatest events in the history of mankind and that the victory of the bolsheviks is a phenomenon of global significance."

It is said that books, like people, have their destinies. The universal historical significance of the events recorded by John Reed determined the destiny of his book which was written by a great master, loyal to the truth of history, and with rare social perspicacity.

After the first translation into Russian was published, in the 1920s it had another ten printings, at which point translations of other works by Reed came out. Subsequently, however, there was "oblivion" for almost one quarter of a century: his main book was not only not reprinted but even rarely mentioned in the press. Furthermore, V.I. Lenin's initial preface was not included in the fourth edition of his works. The picture of the revolution, recreated by Reed truthfully, in Lenin's view, and his presentation of events contradicted the concepts expressed in the "Short Course" of history of the VKP(b), and historiography which developed under its influence.

Nonetheless, life mercilessly proved that truth cannot be "separated" from history. In 1957 "Ten Days That Shook the World" was reissued. Since then there has been an uninterrupted publication of the works of John Reed, including in the languages of the peoples of the USSR.

Such work is continuing to this day. Particularly important is a two-volume work published by Politizdat in the year of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, which contains the so-far fullest collection of his works, including stories, poems, articles, letters, speeches and recollections of Reed by his contemporaries (John Reed. "Izbrannoye" [Selections]. In two volumes. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987). For some of the works included in the collection this is a first translation into the Russian language.

Nonetheless, problems related to the publication of "Ten Days...." remained. As we already noted, in his time Lenin expressed the wish that this book be disseminated in millions of copies and translated into all languages. His wish was honored, for this book is alive and will remain alive throughout the world, including in our country. In the past 30 years the total number of copies published in the USSR has reached an impressive figure. However, is this book (which, as accurately expressed by British communist E. Rothstein, "as in the past excites and inspires," i.e., fulfills the function of communist upbringing) all that available to the broad masses of readers, particularly young people and, specifically, secondary school seniors and university students? We believe that it is too early to "classify" it as part of the canonic series of literary monuments, although such a trend has already been noted. We must popularize the publication of "Ten Days....," with proper comments, and in vivid artistic formats. The book by Reed lives. It is consistent with the spirit of the changes currently taking place in the country and must be "promoted" among the readers, the young people above all!

This does not exclude a different attitude toward this work as well, as a monument, not only literary but also historical, as a unique document of the age. Understandably, no modern specialist in the history of the establishment of the Soviet system in 1917 can ignore Reed's book. Strangely enough, however, so far historians have not made a thorough scientific study of it. Naturally, the work of literary experts is very important, as they consider this book a harbinger of the development of artistic-documentary prose, the prose of "fact."

Reed's book has double meaning to the science of history. It is not only one of the valuable sources for the study of the October age but also the first historical essay about it. In other words, it lies at the origins of the appearance of the historiography of this question. The strictly scientific and truly academic publication of this document, with its historical and historiographic analysis of the text, and commentaries based on the latest achievements of Marxist-Leninist science of history and

interpretation of inaccuracies and even errors made by Reed in the presentation of events, and the highlighting of the contemporary scientific value of this work, has become vitally necessary. Unquestionably, such a work would constitute a major contribution to the further study of the specific development of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the initial response to it in the United States and other countries, and of the international significance of the ineradicable events of 1917.

To John Reed personally, "Ten Days That Shook the World" became not only his most significant work but also his last major work, for he lived slightly over one and a half years after its publication. The months of 1919 and 1920, which passed rapidly, were crowded in his case with true revolutionary struggle and the joy of his forthcoming meeting with "the country of my heart," as he describes Soviet Russia, and, at the same time, persecution by the reaction in his homeland, in the United States.

Reed returned to the land of the soviets in the autumn of 1919, leaving clandestinely the United States and secretly crossing the borders and the line of imperialist blockade surrounding the Soviet republic. He was welcomed in Moscow as the representative of the inchoate American communist movement. He had made his choice, consciously, despite the incredible difficulties which it promised.

In the Soviet capital, Reed established daily contacts with the Comintern Executive Committee and, as he always did, immediately plunged into life around him, eagerly absorbing its new features, facts and events, sharing with toiling Moscow the hardships of "war communism," and meeting dozens of people. He considered as most important his meetings with Lenin. Their personal acquaintanceship had taken place as early as January 1918, shortly prior to Reed's departure for the United States. Now, back in Russia, the young American communist went to Lenin both as the author of a book on the October Revolution and as a person who knew and realistically assessed the situation in his own country, which was increasingly becoming the bulwark of world capitalism.

Reed presumed that his trip to the Soviet Union would take several weeks. However, his return to the United States, equally clandestine, failed. Reed found himself in jail in Finland, from which he was released thanks to Lenin's intervention, only at the beginning of the summer of 1920.

Exhausted by his imprisonment, Reed returned to Soviet Russia. In July and August he took part in the 2nd Congress of the Communist International, at which he was elected member of the Comintern Executive Committee. Soon afterwards, he went to Baku, to attend the congress of the peoples of the Orient. The trip had a tragic outcome: Reed caught typhoid fever. He returned to Moscow, where L. Bryant, who had just come from

New York was waiting for him, already ill. Nonetheless, Reed remained on his post. During that time he turned to Lenin with the request to grant Bryant an interview "so that it can be published in America precisely now, precisely when a frenzied anti-Soviet propaganda is being mounted in that country and the entire capitalist press abounds in attacks on Soviet Russia." The interview was printed in THE WASHINGTON TIMES, noting that Lenin "had shown great interest, asking an endless number of fine questions which proved his unusual knowledge of American politics."

Several days later, on its front page PRAVDA printed the following obituary: "On the night of 16 October, comrade John Reed, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and representative of the United American Communist Party, died of typhoid fever." He was buried in the Kremlin wall on Red Square, along with other fighters for the revolution.

"John Reed (1887-1920)" is the brief inscription on the eternal haven of this great American who, as N.K. Krupskaya said immediately after his death, "understood, with his mind and his heart what the October Revolution was all about..."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

The Problem of Historical Choice

18020005m Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 119-121

[Review by A. Frolov, of the book "Vybor Putey Obshchestvennogo Razvitiya: Teoriya, Istoriya, Sovremennost" [The Choice of Ways of Social Development: Theory, History, Contemporaneity] by P.V. Volobuyev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 312 pp]

[Text] History cannot be turned back and "replayed," for events, after they have taken place, assume the nature of irreversible objective facts which must be taken into consideration. Nothing which is part of the past can be changed. One can only try to understand the extent to which it was necessary. What can we conclude from this? Does it mean that everything which took place could not have taken place differently and that the social forces which tried to channel the trend of historical events into a different direction were wrong?

The question of "what if?" is not popular among historians. Nonetheless, again and again it rises in the social consciousness and, obviously, not without reason. For if we consider it, it is essentially addressed to the future rather than the past. In studying the example of previous generations and the opportunities it used or lost, mankind tries to look into the future and to become, to the extent of the possible, master of its destiny. The actual limits of such an opportunity must be defined with

maximal accuracy and used equally maximally, for today mankind is facing a number of serious choices, the most dramatic of which is whether or not it will survive or perish in a nuclear conflagration.

The socialist world as well has found itself at a sharp turn in history. At the present stage in the development of Soviet society, P.V. Volobuyev, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, emphasizes in his new book, the party and the people are facing, in its entire magnitude, the question which is being successfully solved in a Leninist spirit, that of choosing the ways of further socialist progress, and a turning point has been reached by the country, a situation demanding a choice among different alternative solutions which predetermine the nature and pace of our further progress.

Is such a choice possible as part of the historical process, and if so on what basis?

The author has made a certain methodological and theoretical contribution to the study of this problem. The solution of the problem of choice is the watershed between the materialistic understanding of history, which acknowledges an objective alternating and multi-variant nature of the historical process and the existence within it of several possible ways of development, and mechanistic determinism, which proceeds from the concept of the fatal predetermination of the course of history which, it is alleged, is the result of a simple combination of cause and effect. The other watershed separates the materialistic understanding of history from subjectivism and voluntarism, which do not see in the historical process any objective obstacles to arbitrary actions and the surrender of such actions to simple willpower. Marxism-Leninism, which rejects both extremes, indicates the existence of real grounds for transforming actions by the multi-million strong masses which are thus able to make a choice and determine their own fate. In order to ensure the consolidation of this concept, its accurate theoretical interpretation is needed, the foundations for which exist in the works of Marxist-Leninist classics.

The author brings to light the tremendous contribution made by V.I. Lenin to the development of this range of problems and the inseparable connection between his theoretical research in this area and the solution of the specific problems of the revolutionary-liberation movement in Russia and throughout the world. In his theoretical and political activities, based above all on the experience of the three Russian revolutions, Lenin clearly proved that history always contains a series of objective possibilities of further development. Even a single and historically identical end result leads not to one but to several ways, each one of which is consistent with the interests of a specific class. Such, for example, is the case of the "Prussian" and "American" ways of development of capitalism and agriculture, which were analyzed in detail by Lenin; the various methods for solving problems of national development; and regulation and control of production and distribution.

The book under review describes the typology of such methods, singling out above all the revolutionary and the reformist means of observing historical necessities. In our view, such an analysis would have been more complete had the author taken into consideration yet another important aspect present in Lenin's works. Lenin always clearly distinguished between two basic possible ways, two means of implementing objectively matured historical needs: the reactionary-bureaucratic, promoted by the exploiting classes against the interests of the exploited, and the revolutionary-democratic, implemented by the working people and exploited classes in opposition to the exploiters and for the sake of their own interests. The main feature of the reactionary-bureaucratic way is that it is imposed exclusively from above, and that its purpose is to prevent the development of the revolutionary-democratic way from below.

It is precisely in the class struggle for either of the possible ways of solving any social problem and in the struggle between the methods of reactionary-bureaucratic reforms and the revolutionary activity of the toiling masses that the final result comes out which, to the objectivist, seems to be predetermined and, to the subjectivist, arbitrarily set. This is the most important concept in Lenin's methodology of historical analysis, according to which he developed a specific political strategy followed by the Bolshevik Party in all stages of its revolutionary activities. Its essence was that although one cannot predetermine the resultant of the classes struggling against each other or the development trends they represent, one could and should be clearly aware of the nature of the trends and see to it that the party introduces in this resultant its own contribution not as a minus but as a plus, i.e., by defending the interests of the entire ascending historical development as a whole and the basic and most essential interests of the masses. "We do not despair whatever turns history may take," Lenin wrote. "However, nor shall we allow any given turn in history to take part without our participation, without the real intervention of the progressive class" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 24, p 7). Furthermore, according to Lenin, a politician who has a clear concept of the historical dialectics of the objective and the subjective should learn how to recall one event or another, should he believe that such an event is based on serious and profound historical reasons. In other words, history offers a number of opportunities and each alternative is, in its own way, necessary. However, there is an even more comprehensive one, which proclaims its existence ever more strongly: the real universal-historical need for the choice of a type of development possibilities which would be most consistent with the interests of the masses.

The most important feature of Lenin's approach is the understanding that, sooner or later, there are moments in history during which reactionary-bureaucratic and conservative ways become totally useless and find themselves in a dead end situation, at which point the revolutionary creativity of the broad popular masses,

which assume the role of the true subject of the historical process, becomes a necessary form of social progress. The socialist revolution in Russia, to which P.V. Volobuyev pays prime attention, is the clearest example of this.

In a certain sense the revolutionary age of 1917 is unique because, as a result of the overthrow of the monarchy, both possible outcomes of a bourgeois revolution were simultaneous: the twin power of the Provisional Government and the soviets appeared, as a clear embodiment of the alternative to a reactionary-bureaucratic and a revolutionary-democratic way of solving the national crisis, which had been greatly intensified by the imperialist war. This aggravated to the extreme the situation concerning the choice of a further development, thus indicating, as the author shows, the real "mechanism" of historical development.

To this day our ideological opponents are trying to start an argument as to whether the choice made by the people's masses in the October Revolution was the only possible and true one. However, this question was resolved by history a long time ago: the struggle against the "threatening catastrophe" and the general paralysis of the country was possible only through a revolutionary-democratic way which, under specific Russian conditions, coincided, taking into consideration the existence of a necessary minimum of objective prerequisites, with a conversion to socialism. In our view, the author convincingly brings to light the innovative nature of Lenin's approach to the task of converting the country to a new, a socialist way. The transition to socialism was considered by Lenin not as something unusual or exceptional but as the only practical solution to the most profound crisis of the bourgeois-landowning system in which Russia had found itself, i.e., as a specific answer to the specific problems of its social development. Socialism, which was the objective and the ideal of the labor movement, was a national need, the natural way of ascending historical development and a conversion to it was a nationwide task. This abolished, theoretically and practically, the abstract-doctrinary thesis of menshevism concerning the insufficient level of maturity reached by Russia for socialism. Also of tremendous importance was Lenin's conclusion to the effect that the solution of urgent general democratic problems can be ensured only by taking the path to socialism instead of bourgeois development. This conclusion opened to the Russian proletariat the real possibility of relying in its struggle for socialism on the tremendous revolutionary-democratic potential of popular movements.

Alternate developments, the author notes, are inherent in socialist society as well. Its development must also solve some objective contradictions and has an inner need for constant renovation, which precisely is what creates the need for choosing one alternative or another, which are no longer of a class and, consequently, of an antagonistic nature. This problem was only briefly noted in the book and, obviously, could be the subject of a

separate study under conditions in which the party and the people have made a firm and scientifically substantiated choice in favor of accelerating the development and ensuring the qualitative renovation of all aspects of social life.

On the basis of a theoretical study of the problem and of extensive historical data, the author also considers the question of the choice of a socialist way today by developed capitalist and liberated countries. This part of the book is more sketchy which, actually, is explained by the complexity of the problem and the fact that the objective conditions required for its solution are still in their development stage. As a whole, this theoretical study of an alternate multivariant nature of social development and possibility of historical choice based on it enables us to draw important conclusions on the legitimate realization of historical necessity and contributes to our increased knowledge on this most important problem of contemporary history.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

Painters in the Great Patriotic War

18020005n Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 121-123

[Review by A. Lebedev, member of the USSR Academy of Fine Arts, of the book "Khudozhestvennaya Letopis Velikoy Otechestvennoy" [Artistic Chronicle of the Great Patriotic War] by Ye.V. Zaytsev. Iskustvo, Moscow, 1986, 496 pp]

[Text] Many outstanding works of art were created on the topic of the immortal exploit of the Soviet people in the course of the unparalleled trials of the last war, which not only express the feelings, thoughts and moods of the authors but also somehow concentrate in a graphic form the emotions experienced by the Soviet people and their profound thoughts and harsh practical experience. It would be difficult to overestimate the tremendous ideological-aesthetic and educational significance of artistic creativity.

Unfortunately, by no means everything which deals with such an important topic and what is a truly valuable and comprehensive creative material has been discussed in art publications, thoroughly analyzed and scientifically evaluated.

In this connection, we cannot fail to note the study made by Ye.V. Zaytsev, showing the role which painters of the Russian Federation and their combative, creative and defense-labor activities played during the war. The book is saturated with interesting statements and recollections by painters and comes with excellent illustrations.

The author analyzes the works of more than 500 painters, sculptors, graphic designers and architects in the republic. Works on the topic of the Patriotic War are considered by the author not only for the period of the war but also for the postwar period, through the start of the 1980s.

The author clearly describes the tremendous patriotic upsurge of the Soviet people during the war years. More than 700 Russian painters went to the front. Many of them fought in partisan detachments, camouflaged defense projects, dug trenches, defused incendiary bombs and evacuated museum exhibits. Painters created paintings and sculptures, posters and pamphlets, drew portraits of war heroes and caricatures of Hitlerites, and exposed scaremongers and cowards. This was a militant, a combat art, which actively participated in the nationwide struggle against the Hitlerite aggressors and in winning the desired and difficult victory. During the war the authors of posters and satirical drawings received many letters from soldiers who thanked them for the fact that with their work they had helped them to fight more fiercely. Thus, V.B. Koretskiy, who created the exciting poster "Red Army Soldier, To the Rescue!" received dozens of letters from the front. "Every pilot in our aviation regiment," Captain Lisogor wrote to the artist, "carries this poster in his map-case, recalling the appeal 'to the rescue!' when he takes off to bomb the Hitlerite executioners."

The militant and creative efforts of painters in blockaded Leningrad, who carried out the assignments of the political directorate on the Leningrad front and the Baltic Fleet command, were a true exploit. They drew, painted, glued together, hungry, in unheated premises, without water, under the light of oil lamps, always short of sleep. Some of them died of exhaustion on the job.

Many masters of the graphic art were presented with high governmental awards for heroism at the front and the rear. Those who had particularly distinguished themselves were awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. The war took tremendous casualties and one out of two painters who went to the front did not return.

In his analysis of works of different types, genres and styles, the author emphasizes their innovative nature which profoundly described the characteristics and features of the Great Patriotic War. He also convincingly proves that the Soviet painters relied on the progressive traditions of V.V. Vereshchagin, M.B. Grekov, F.I. Shubin and others. "Their best works," he writes, "developed into a broad and comprehensive ideological and aesthetic trend in their artistic study of the life of the people and the country during the Great Patriotic War" (p 6).

In bringing to light the characteristics of the development of the graphic arts during the war, Ye.V. Zaytsev notes above all the documentary nature of their works, their passion and vivid expressiveness and propaganda

power. New types and ways of artistic creativity appeared, such as sculpted propaganda panels, enlarged paintings on posters along highways, series of graphics, exhibit albums, etc. A leading position in the graphic arts was assumed by drawings, and especially genres which did not require any especially favorable conditions and means. They were distinguished by mobility and possibility rapidly to respond to events, great power of propaganda impact, occasionally intensified by combining artistic with poetic characters. Kukryniksi's poster "Let Us Mercilessly Rout and Destroy the Enemy!" was pasted up throughout the walls of Moscow on the third day of the war. At the same time, V.A. Serov's poster appeared on the squares of Leningrad: "We Were, We Are and We Shall Be!"

In describing the great contribution which painters made to art in the homeland, and carefully studying the works of various types and genres, the author brings to light the characteristics of the creative individuality of every major master, and the typical aspects of his style and composition, color and plastic solutions.

The author emphasizes the tremendous importance of the best graphic works during the Great Patriotic War. Posters and satirical drawings by Kukryniksi, such as "I Lost a Wheel," "Fritz's Transformation," or "They Said Hello at Orel and Responded in Rome" are unsurpassable examples of world-class drawings.

The paintings by A.A. Plastov, S.V. and I.M. Gerasimov, and A.A. Deynek, the drawings of D.A. Shmarinov, B.I. Prorokov and A.F. Pakhomov and the sculptures, monuments and memorial ensembles by V.I. Mukhina, Ye.V. Vuchetich, N.V. Tonskiy, M.K. Anikushin, L.Ye. Kerbel, V.Ye. Tsigal, A.P. Kibalnikov, M.G. Manizer, O.S. Kiryukhin and many other masters are among the highest examples of the graphic arts, inordinately profound and truthfully reflecting World War II events.

We can claim with full justification that Soviet graphic art in the 1941-1945 period honorably fulfilled its historical assignment. It rose to a new qualitative level of development in the sense of idea-mindedness and artistry; its social influence became more efficient and its international reputation grew.

A great deal was said abroad as well about the striking impact of Soviet art, the political poster in particular, during the war. Noteworthy is the statement made by the British writer F. Cruz: "The quality of the works had to be extremely high.... If the posters designed by Kukryniksi, Vasilyev, Yefimov, Ivanov and Dolgorukhov would be exhibited on the walls of British factories, thousands of miles away from their homeland, and displayed for people raised in an entirely different environment, they would convince and impress ordinary people more than the works of their own painters."

The second part of the book describes the way the topic of the Great Patriotic War was creatively developed by painters in 1945-1980.

The time has come for a more profound evaluation, study and summation of past events and their new reflection in artistic creativity. Today painting and sculpture have assumed a leading position in the graphic arts. The works of our painters, sculptors and architects have crossed the boundaries of the homeland. Monuments, ensembles, obelisks in memory of the war years were built by Soviet masters in a number of foreign cities which, in their time, were liberated by the Soviet army.

The author describes the process of intensive work done by painters to master new ways and means of expression, to enrich the genre-stylistic forms of their art and to increase their mastery of composition, color and plasticity. The trend toward intensified psychological interpretation of characters increased in the work of the painters in the postwar years. We see clear aspiration to synthesize art, to include in sculptural-architectural projects mosaics, frescoes, music and sound elements, and light-color effects, which increase the power of their ideological-emotional influence. Many works created in postwar times have become nationally famous and a true pride of our culture. This includes the impressive portraits of war heroes, done by Ye.V. Vuchetich, N.V. Tonskiy, V.Ye. Tsigal, L.Ye. Kerbel, P.D. Korin and P.I. Kotov, and the outstanding canvasses by Kukryniksi ("The End"), S.V. Gerasimov ("The Mother of the Partisan"), P.A. Krivonogov ("Victory"), A.I. Laktionov ("Letter From the Front"), Yu.M. Neprintsev ("Respite After the Battle"), G.M. Korzhev ("Burned With the Flames of War"), B.S. Ugarov ("Leningrad Woman"), A.A. Mylnikov ("Parting") and others, along with drawings, engravings and illustrations by D.A. Shmarinov, A.F. Pakhomov, V.V. Bogatkin and B.I. Prorokov. Even a simple enumeration of all significant works would be impossible. The author pays particular attention to the study of the ideological and artistic qualities of the great memorials based on the combination of art with architecture. This includes the famous monument-ensemble to Soviet soldiers in Berlin's Treptow-Park, the monument-ensemble "Heroes of the Stalingrad Battle" in Volgograd, the ensemble at the Piskarev Cemetery and monuments to the heroic defenders of Leningrad during the Great Patriotic War, the "Brest Fortress-Hero" memorial and others.

In tracing the process of the development of art in the postwar period, the author does not ignore shortcomings. He notes, in particular, the erroneous trend toward "gigantomania" in the building of monuments, according to which efforts were made to make the works expressive through monumental dimensions. There was no particular need for the author to consider in such detail the unsuccessful plan for a monument to victory on Poklonnaya Gora in Moscow.

The illustrations in the book have been well chosen. However, for a strange reason, they fail to include some

significant works, such as "Harvest" by A.A. Plastov, "The Accusation" by Kukryniksi and others. Instead, paintings of no particular value have been included.

As a whole, the book under review is a thorough art study.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987

05003

New Studies of U.S. Foreign Policy

18020005o Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 17, Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) pp 123-127

[Review by V. Furayev, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences corresponding member, professor]

[Text] The problems of contemporary foreign policy of the biggest imperialist country, the United States, have invariably attracted broad public opinion. This interest has particularly increased in our days, when a positive change has been noted in Soviet-American relations and preparations are underway for the forthcoming visit to Washington by M.S. Gorbachev. Soviet scientific publications of the 1980s have provided a comprehensive study of the class foundations, sources and motive forces of U.S. foreign policy, American foreign political strategy and its most important ideological and theoretical concepts. Let us particularly note the two-volume work "Sovremennaya Vneshnaya Politika SShA" [U.S. Contemporary Foreign Policy] (G.A. Trofimenko, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, vol 1, 462 pp; vol 2, 479 pp), prepared by the USSR Academy of Sciences U.S. and Canada Institute, which is a basic and comprehensive study of American foreign policy from the end of World War II to the beginning of the 1980s. In recently published works, scientists in the field of international affairs have dealt with interrelated and similar aspects of U.S. foreign policy, paying considerable attention to its implementation in the present decade. Studies of the organizational structure, functions and activities of the widespread mechanism engaged in the formulation and exercise of U.S. foreign policy are of great theoretical and practical significance ("Mekhanizm Formirovaniya Vneshney Politiki SShA" [Mechanism of the Shaping of U.S. Foreign Policy]. G.A. Trofimenko and P.T. Podlesnyy, responsible editors. Nauka, Moscow, 1986, 206 pp). This collective work, based on extensive use of original sources, is a continuation of a study which was done previously, based on data from the first 25 years after the war, dealing essentially with the 1950s and 1960s (see "SShA: Vneshnepoliticheskiy Mekhanizm. Organizatsiya, Funktsii, Upravleniye" [United States: Foreign Policy Mechanism. Organization, Functions, Management]. Nauka, Moscow, 1972, 368 pp).

As accurately noted in the book, the process of shaping American foreign policy is complex and contradictory. It reflects the features of the domestic situation in the

country and changes in the international situation, the rivalry among influential groups within monopoly capital and other groups of the dominating class, the correlation of forces in the congress, the positions held by the social organizations and other factors. Dozens of governmental agencies are involved in the execution of foreign policy. Its shaping is influenced by organizations and individuals who are frequently totally outside the official mechanism.

In noting this circumstance, with full justification the authors ascribe prime importance to the study of the decision making process at the summit, i.e., in the White House. It is precisely the U.S. state mechanism that must take into consideration and coordinate the variety of positions which become apparent in drafting a foreign policy decision and find ways for the formulation and adoption of the type of actions which would represent the interests of the entire ruling class. Practical experience has indicated that by no means is this achieved in each specific case and in all foreign policy areas.

The increased expansion of American imperialism after World War II and the intensification of its struggle against world socialism and the forces of social and national liberation under new historical circumstances led to the expansion and increased complexity of the foreign policy mechanism. The difficulties encountered by the U.S. ruling class within the country and in the international arena at the start of the 1970s faced the American government with the need to amend its foreign policy strategy and to improve its foreign policy making mechanism. This precisely explains the reorganization which was initiated by the end of the 1960s and which was continued in the 1970s. The conversion by the United States at the end of the 1970s and beginning of 1980s to increased rigidity in relations with the socialist community, the intensive increase in military power and the extensive use of force in the international arena left their mark on the changes in its foreign policy mechanism. The authors' conclusion to the effect that this process was significantly influenced by the growing inconsistency inherent in U.S. foreign policy, the rejection of assumed contractual obligations and profound disparities between the statements and the actions of the White House, is entirely accurate. An essential factor in this case has been the appearance in the last decade in the upper echelons of power of a number of political personalities lacking the necessary professional knowledge, training and experience in the area of international politics.

Establishing the manner in which current trends in the development of the U.S. foreign policy mechanism have been manifested in practice in the increased role of the presidential machinery and the circle closest to the head of state in drafting and making decisions on foreign policy problems is of unquestionable interest. The influence of a political personality, such as the assistant to the president for national security affairs, who heads the National Security Council (NSC) has increased. Created

in 1947, at the beginning of the 1980s the NSC had become an agency which not only performed the function of coordinating the activities of the foreign policy apparatus and the military and intelligence departments of the United States but had also assumed responsibility for the formulation and adoption of the most important decisions on matters of national security. The elevation of the NSC reduced the role of the Department of State in shaping the U.S. foreign policy course. In turn, this became a source of friction and differences of opinion at the top. We can only agree with the authors' conclusion as to the openly militaristic trend of the NSC. "Today the NSC is a military-political authority which is unconstitutional and inaccessible to control by the public or any other institutions. It is actually the highest echelon of the American governmental system" ("Mekhanizm Formirovaniya Vneshey Politiki SShA," p 79).

The influence of the Pentagon and the CIA in shaping American foreign policy has sharply increased in recent years under the pressure of right-wing conservative and most militant groups in the ruling class. Its militarization is not only the result of the influence of groups of the monopoly bourgeoisie, closely related to the military-industrial complex, but also the direct participation in the exercise of foreign policy by a number of noted representatives of big business who have gone into government. An example of this is Caspar Weinberger, who has held the position of secretary of defense for a long time, and George Schultz, who heads the Department of State. In the past both held top positions in the Bechtel Corporation, which is one of the biggest companies specializing in designing and building civilian and military projects for the U.S. infrastructure and abroad. Nongovernmental instruments of militaristic influence on foreign policy also play a considerable role. This includes closed organizations of the financial oligarchy and its political elite, philanthropic foundations, various conservative societies and committees, etc.

Let us note yet another essential trend in the development of the U.S. foreign policy mechanism, singled out in the book. The period of a certain decline in the influence of Congress in solving foreign policy problems (the 1950s-1960s) has been replaced by a period of foreign policy activism (1970s-1980s). However, we should not overestimate the role of differences and clashes between Capitol Hill and the White House. What is determining, in the final account, is their interaction in the implementation of the foreign policy course. As a whole, this problem requires a more profound interpretation, particularly one based on specific data of the last decade.

Historical experience indicates that whatever changes may have been made in the structure of the foreign policy mechanism, adapted to the needs of the ruling circles, such changes cannot have any substantial influence on the objectives and nature of U.S. foreign policy. Nonetheless, we must not fail to see the way in which broad public opinion in the United States is turning into

an active foreign policy factor. Criticism of the course charted by the Reagan administration, intensified of late among various social circles throughout the country, and the anti-nuclear actions of the American public are restraining to a certain extent the militant strategists and, at the same time, triggering sharp debates concerning the long-term foreign policy of the United States and reaching agreements with the Soviet Union on limiting and reducing nuclear armaments. It is not astounding that great efforts are being made in the United States to cultivate through the mass information media a hostility toward the USSR and to instill in the minds of ordinary Americans the image of an "enemy nation." In particular, this was the purpose of the anti-Soviet serial "Amerika," produced by ABC.

The intensified study provided in scientific publications of the development of U.S. foreign policy from the end of the 1960s to the middle of the 1980s is of considerable interest. This was a period of change of administrations headed by Nixon, Ford, Carter and Reagan (R.S. Ovinnikov, "Zigzag Vneshney Politiki SShA. Ot Niksona do Reygana" [Zigzags of U.S. Foreign Policy. From Nixon to Reagan]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1986, 400 pp). It was precisely during that period that the contradictory nature of U.S. foreign policy became particularly striking and the guidelines of peaceful coexistence and detente were replaced by a policy of force and imperial ambitions.

The intensive study of documents of the legislative and executive powers, memoirs, materials from the American press and other sources have enable the author to trace the working of the innersprings of the foreign policy mechanism, which are concealed from the outsider's view, and to become acquainted with the personal participation of noted U.S. governmental and political leaders, such as presidents, secretaries of state, presidential assistants for national security and others, in shaping and executing foreign policy. The consideration of the subjective aspect of the problem has been combined with a study of interests, positions and views held by the most influential groups of the ruling class on the most important foreign policy problems over a span covering more than 15 years. In this case the description of the specific ways of acting of the innersprings governing U.S. foreign policy at each specific stage of its development is of great importance.

The study of the activities of forces operating behind the screen, which determine the trend and nature of the U.S. course in the international arena leads the author to the conclusion that a leading role in this process is played by the biggest Eastern seaboard groups of the American financial oligarchy—the Rockefellers, Morgans and Fords. Holding a dominating position in the country's economics and politics, they control the key positions in the various departments which formulate and implement the foreign policy course. The companies, banks

and "philanthropic" foundations of these monopoly groups finance scientific research centers, which supply ideas and cadres to the American administrations.

Whereas in the 1960s and 1970s the Brookings Institution, known for its moderate political pragmatism, had a considerable influence on governmental policies, starting with the 1980s other "brain trusts" emerged on the foreground: the Georgetown University Center for International and Strategic Studies, the American Enterprise Institute and the Hoover Institute on Wars, Revolutions and Peace of Stanford University (California). Neoconservatives from the Western states established close ties with right-wing forces in the Northeastern part of the country. The credo of the most militant policy-study centers indicates that they are distinguished by their extreme conservatism and extremist nature of concepts, which became the base of the foreign policy course charted by the Reagan administration.

The Heritage Foundation, a "brain trust" with an extreme right-wing orientation, which has extensively used lobbying in Congress, particularly during hearings on important political problems by the Senate and the House of Representatives, which became quite well known in the 1980s, is a convincing example of this fact. The foundation actively engaged in the formulation of the idea of the use of outer space in achieving U.S. military superiority over the Soviet Union. The recommendations which the foundation gave to the Reagan administration during its second term included the rejection of the Salt II Treaty and the ABM Treaty, pursuing the accelerated growth of the nuclear arsenal of the United States, implementation of the SDI program, refusal to sign a treaty on total and universal banning of nuclear tests and an agreement on the banning of chemical weapons, keeping in limbo the Soviet-American talks on arms limitations, etc. It is indicative that the members of that same "triumvirate," i.e., the Rockefellers, Morgans and Fords, are among the main contributors to institutions which guide U.S. foreign policy.

A study of U.S. foreign policy is impossible without an analysis of the concepts and doctrines with the help of which throughout the postwar decades American imperialism has pursued its expansionistic aspirations. The list of works on U.S. foreign policy doctrines was recently increased by a study in which the substantiation of the expansionist course of the American political leadership is considered in chronological sequence for the entire postwar period (I.I. Utkin, "Strategiya Globalnoy Ekspansii. Vneshnepoliticheskiye Doktriny SShA" [Strategy of Global Expansion. U.S. Foreign Policy Doctrines]. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1986, 288 pp).

The author indicates that the formulation of the strategy of U.S. global expansion started in World War II, when favorable conditions for American imperialism developed in the arena of international politics. The growth of U.S. economic power and its temporary monopoly of

nuclear weapons, control over German and Japanese industrial resources and the weakening of Western European countries were all factors which opened the way to the enhancement of the United States and strengthened in the minds of American political strategists the idea of American superiority and America's "natural" right to lead the world.

For more than 4 decades the ruling U.S. circles have been developing, amending and perfecting an "optimal strategy... of a policy for structuring and preserving the type of world order which would secure for the United States exclusive opportunities and privileges" (p 10). However, this task proved impossible to implement. The correlation of forces in the world changed. The Soviet Union attained military-strategic parity with the United States. The policy of the members of the socialist community restrained the aggressive aspirations of American imperialism. The Western European countries and Japan began to press the United States in the trade-economic and technological areas. The role of the developing states increased in all areas of international life. The result was the obvious illusory nature of creating a world order by the United States, based on the American model. The entire course of U.S. development made it necessary for the United States to adapt its global strategy to international realities, and thus to try to retain the positions it had reached and to hinder the process of a diminishing importance of the United States in a changing world.

This book enables us to trace the efforts of the last four American administrations to find the most efficient ways of preserving the dominant influence of the United States in the nonsocialist part of the world. The Nixon and Ford administrations tried to implement the concept of building a 5-pointed world (United States-Western Europe-Japan-USSR-PRC) within which each link would ensure to a certain extent the stabilization of relations among the main "power centers" and, at the same time, would have a restraining influence on the unstable zone—the developing countries. This presumed that the United States would retain a global role in the world arena, which would include a possible clash among "power centers" and their reciprocal weakening, paralleled by a growth of U.S. military potential. However, the American strategists ignored the fact that each of these "poles" had its own national interests in accordance with which it pursued its own political course. Life proved to be considerably more complex and varied than the Nixon-Kissinger plan.

Washington's line was also unsuccessful during the Carter administration when the doctrine of the tripartite alliance (United States-Western Europe-Japan) was adopted as a base. It stipulated cohesive actions by developed capitalist countries aimed against world socialism, the peoples of the developing countries and the revolutionary movement. The intensified competitive struggle among the main centers of interimperialist

rivalry and the aspiration of EEC countries and Japan to strengthen their positions defeated the plans of the supporters of the tripartite scheme.

The Reagan administration, the author emphasizes, returned, this time under new conditions, to the concept of a bipolar world, which the United States supported after World War II, when the cold war against the USSR and the other socialist countries was started and waged. This line was embodied in the course aimed at achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union through large-scale militaristic programs, including SDI. Ignoring the objective possibilities of the United States and scorning the danger of expansionism in a nuclear age, the current administration set as its objective to broaden Washington's zone of influence with the help of a policy based on military power. The doctrine of "neoglobalism" appeared.

The book by A.I. Utkin is distinguished by the clarity of the author's view on the development of American foreign policy, original judgments and singling out common features in U.S. foreign policy strategy which have been part of it during the entire postwar period, despite various changes.

Contemporary bourgeois geopolitics is also part of the arsenal of political doctrines used to substantiate imperialist expansion. As we know, this trend in political thinking is based on the extreme exaggeration of the influence of a country's physical-geographic location on its domestic and foreign policy. This precisely is the basis of the concept of the predetermination of aggressive foreign policy caused by objective factors. The study on contemporary imperialist policy (I.B. Ponomareva and N.A. Smirnova. "Geopolitika Imperializma SShA. Atlanticheskoye Napravleniye" [U.S. Imperialist Geopolitics. Atlantic Trend]. Edited by Academician Ye.M. Primakov. Mysl, Moscow, 1986, 493 pp) notes that for quite some time Washington has been using the geopolitical approach to international problems, within which the targets and means of U.S. activities in the world arena are coordinated. Most American foreign policy doctrines of postwar times are based on geopolitical principles. Traditional geographic criteria are expanded with the addition of qualitative or quantitative indicators, such as the scientific and technical level of development of a given country, national mentality, political institutions, and others.

The basic geopolitical postulates of American bourgeois theoreticians include their consideration of the power factor as most important in international relations and the use of the formula of "national security order," which allegedly is "flexible" and could "expand" according to the power possibilities of the state and, finally, assigning to the United States the role of "equalizer" in international affairs, i.e., that of a global superempire. As a rule, contemporary geopolitical concepts are based on anticommunism and anti-Sovietism.

The combined use of a variety of power instruments is the main tool in imperialist geopolitics. In addition to military power (or in combination with it), and depending on the circumstances, the time and place, extensive use is made of nonmilitary factors—economic, scientific and technical and ideological—in influencing the policies of other countries. The use of all such means is aimed at attaining the main objective: the implementation of the U.S. claim to world hegemony. Essentially, the global scale of expansion presumes an unlimited use of force.

Relations among countries in the international arena are considered by the geopoliticians from the viewpoint of their confrontation. They ascribe to the confrontation between socialism and capitalism a military nature, charging the Soviet Union with "expansionistic" aspirations and the desire to broaden its "sphere of influence" and other features inherent in U.S. foreign policy.

The critical evaluation of geopolitical theories and the study of their influence on U.S. foreign policies and activities of supragovernmental institutions, which were set up to ensure U.S. economic and military leadership in the capitalist world and control over political processes, enable us to determine the reasons for the groundlessness of the geopolitical approach to international life. The creators of such doctrines and their supporters are incapable of providing an objective assessment of the changes occurring in the world and to reason in accordance with the realities of the nuclear space age. They consider power the principal means of preserving U.S. leadership in the capitalist world, asserting the interests of American monopolies in the developing countries and, at the same time, having a means of obtaining huge superprofits and "exhausting" the potential enemy. The falsity and unrealistic nature of geopolitical concepts and the threat to the entire world of the use of a policy of total confrontation should not conceal the fact that to this day geopolitics is used by the ruling U.S. circles as an instrument in influencing its allies.

Nonetheless, we cannot agree with the categorical conclusion drawn by the authors to the effect that "despite the persistent efforts of the Americans, the erosion experienced by the 'Atlantic policy' of the 1960s and 1970s is irreversible" and that "efforts are being made in Western Europe to protect itself from the U.S. adventurist course, which is being felt even within NATO" (p 464).

Recent events have irrefutably proved how strong are the positions of the supporters of the "nuclear containment" doctrine among the leading NATO agencies and the governmental circles of Great Britain, the FRG and a number of other Western European countries, and the obstacles on the way to a nuclear disarmament that are being erected by the supporters of the militaristic course.

The value of the new studies of contemporary U.S. foreign policy is that these works combine the sum total of problems and bring to light the objective and subjective factors which determine the foreign policy course of the United States. They analyze the profound processes which allow us to see the content, ways and means of implementation of American foreign policy, its ideological substantiations and the effect of its mechanism. These books convincingly prove that a grave shortage of a new type of political thinking exists in the ruling elite of the United States, which defines and directs the foreign policy of this imperialist country, a thinking which is extremely necessary today, when international relations have reached a critical level and when the future of all mankind is threatened.

Today Soviet students of American affairs are facing new and exceptionally important and responsible tasks, as presented in M.S. Gorbachev's speech on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. They demand extensive and intensive work and daring and creative approaches, and a profound analysis of the trends and processes developing within the political and social spheres of the United States, the leading country in the contemporary capitalist world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

05003

Meeting with Workers

18020005p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17,
Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) p 128

[Text] A meeting between enterprise workers and journal associates was held at the Stankostroitel'nyy Zavod imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze Production Association (Moscow) on 28 October. The journal's associates described the work of the editors under conditions of restructuring and spoke on the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Journal KOMMUNIST, and the topics of future publications. In their statements, the members of the collective of the enterprise spoke of the socioeconomic and political problems which are today affecting the collective and on the way in which such problems should be discussed in KOMMUNIST. The participants in the meeting were interested in problems of the periodization of the history of socialism and assessments of restructuring occurring in various areas of our life. They expressed their views on the ways of developing democratic principles in production management and emphasized the importance of providing systematic coverage of party life and work in the journal.

The wish was also expressed to increase the variety of forms of presentation of the materials and to make them clearer and more accessible to understanding. All suggestions and critical remarks were studied by the journal's editors at a party meeting and will be used in the journal's practical activities.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

05003

Chronicle

18020005q Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17,
Nov 87 (signed to press 11 Nov 87) p 128

[Text] A meeting between KOMMUNIST editors and heads of departments and teachers of CPSU history in various cities was held at the Institute for Upgrading the Skill of Social Science Teachers of Moscow State University.

Speakers at the meeting, who discussed the work of the journal, noted the increased interest of readers in the history of Soviet society and the importance of the fastest possible elimination of still extant "blank spots" in covering, above all, events of the 1920s and 1930s, the intensified research on matters of intraparty struggle at that time, and the life and activities of noted party leaders. The participants in the discussion noted the lack of articles in the journal on the theory and practice of party building. The editors answered questions, including some concerning the planned publications in the journal for 1988.

The editors were visited by a delegation of the Mexican Socialist Party, consisting of members of the party's National Coordination Commission L. Valdez, P. Gomez and X. Ortega. An exchange of views took place on problems of restructuring in the USSR and its influence on the conditions of the struggle waged by the forces of peace, social progress and national liberation.

H. Shumacher, responsible editor of NEUE GESELLSCHAFT, journal of the German Social Democratic Party, shared with the editors his impressions from his participation in the celebrations in Moscow in connection with the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Problems of the creative contacts between the two journals were discussed as well.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

05003

Publication Data

18020005r Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17,
Nov 87

English Title: KOMMUNIST, No 17, November 1987
Russian title: KOMMUNIST, 17 (1315), Noyabr 1987
Editors: N.B. Bikkenin (editor-in-chief), A.I. Antipov, E.A. Arab-Ogly, B.S. Arkhipov, K.N. Brutents, I.A. Dedkov, V.I. Kadulin, S.V. Kolesnikov, O.R. Latsis, Yu.L. Molchanov, Ye.Z. Razumov, V.F. Rubtsov, N.N. Sibiryakov, Yu.A. Sklyarov, V.P. Trubnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, S.F. Yarmolyuk.

Publishing House: Izdatelstvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication: Moscow

Date of Publication: November 1987

Signed to Press: 11 November 1987

Copies: 1,065,000

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1987

END

10

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.